

George Howard Hungerford to be first lieutenant.  
 Frank Nifong Chilton to be first lieutenant.  
 Alleyne von Schrader to be first lieutenant.  
 John Mitchell Willis to be first lieutenant.  
 Harry Garfield Ford to be first lieutenant.  
 Albert Patton Clark to be first lieutenant.  
 Carl Ahrendt Scherer to be first lieutenant.  
 Joseph Linton Siner to be first lieutenant.  
 James Franklin Johnston to be first lieutenant.  
 William Denton to be first lieutenant.  
 Charles Evans McBrayer to be first lieutenant.  
 Samuel Smith Creighton to be first lieutenant.  
 Lauren Samuel Eckels to be first lieutenant.  
 Edgar D. Craft to be first lieutenant.  
 Kerwin Weidman Kinard to be first lieutenant.  
 Fred Rexford Burnside to be first lieutenant.  
 William Thatcher Cade, jr., to be first lieutenant.  
 George Graham Divins to be first lieutenant.  
 Lloyd Ambrose Kefauver to be first lieutenant.  
 Gordon Brooks Underwood to be first lieutenant.  
 Faris Morell Blair to be first lieutenant.  
 George Emory Pariseau to be first lieutenant.  
 Francis Xavier Strong to be first lieutenant.  
 Henry Poindexter Carter to be first lieutenant.  
 Robert Henry Gantt to be first lieutenant.  
 William Armistead Gills to be first lieutenant.  
 Henry Allison Ingalls to be first lieutenant.

## CHAPLAIN.

Rev. Henry Lester Durrant to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant.

## CAVALRY ARM.

Everett Collins to be second lieutenant.

## FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Bernard Robertson Peyton to be second lieutenant.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Edgar Bergman Colladay to be second lieutenant.  
 George Donald Riley to be second lieutenant.  
 Douglas Campbell Cordiner to be second lieutenant.  
 Julian Sommerville Hatcher to be second lieutenant.  
 Fred Mortimer Green to be second lieutenant.  
 Delmar Samuel Lenzner to be second lieutenant.  
 Oliver Loving Spiller to be second lieutenant.  
 Ruskin Peirce Hall to be second lieutenant.  
 Austin McCarthy McDonnell to be second lieutenant.  
 Roland Wilbur Pinger to be second lieutenant.  
 Donald Armstrong to be second lieutenant.  
 Franklin Babcock to be second lieutenant.  
 Hermann Heinrich Zornig to be second lieutenant.  
 Gladeon Marcus Barnes to be second lieutenant.  
 Earl James Wilson Ragsdale to be second lieutenant.  
 Raycroft Walsh to be second lieutenant.  
 Harvey Clark Allen to be second lieutenant.  
 Edward Bennett Dennis to be second lieutenant.  
 Roger Baldwin Colton to be second lieutenant.

## INFANTRY ARM.

Whitmon Robert Conolly to be second lieutenant.  
 Frank Anderson Sloan to be second lieutenant.  
 Russell Peter Hartle to be second lieutenant.  
 Oswald Hurtt Saunders to be second lieutenant.  
 Spencer Ball Akin to be second lieutenant.  
 Robert Gibson Sherrard to be second lieutenant.

## PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

Enrique Urrutia, jr., to be second lieutenant.  
 Arturo Moreno Calderon to be second lieutenant.  
 Carlos Manuel Lopez to be second lieutenant.  
 Rafael Bird to be second lieutenant.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Midshipman Timothy J. Keleher to be an ensign.  
 Passed Asst. Paymaster Frank T. Watrous to be a paymaster.  
 Asst. Paymaster John J. Luchsinger to be a passed assistant paymaster.  
 Asst. Paymaster Joseph E. McDonald to be a passed assistant paymaster.  
 Asst. Paymaster Everett G. Morsell to be a passed assistant paymaster.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters:  
 Smith Hempstone,  
 Harry W. Rusk, jr., and  
 Harold C. Gwynne.

## POSTMASTERS.

## ALABAMA.

William T. Hogan, Phoenix.

## GEORGIA.

William J. Evans, Stillmore.  
 James J. Gordy, Richland.  
 George A. Poche, Washington.

## ILLINOIS.

Fred R. Brill, Hampshire.  
 Jessie Roush, Lena.

## KANSAS.

Curt M. Higley, Cawker City.  
 Joseph McCreary, Coffeyville.  
 Harry C. Smith, Hill City.

## MICHIGAN.

C. Guy Perry, Lowell.  
 Edwin A. Smith, Wayne.  
 Clara Spore, Rockford.

## MINNESOTA.

Anton O. Lea, New Richland.

## MISSOURI.

George N. Gromer, Pattonsburg.  
 Andrew J. Siebert, Ste. Genevieve.

## NEW JERSEY.

William B. Goodenough, Farmingdale.

## NEW YORK.

Warren D. Burtis, Woodmere.  
 B. S. Preston, Roxbury.  
 Samuel L. Riley, Bronxville.  
 Homer E. Snyder, Victor.  
 Amelia L. Tyler, Hurleyville.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Gladys Thompson, Kensal.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles B. Boyd, Mars.  
 Samuel M. Turk, Parkers Landing.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Frederic Minshall, Abbeville.

## TEXAS.

Charles W. Atkins, Stamford.  
 Robert T. Bartley, Ladonia.  
 William P. Fleming, Georgetown.  
 Vidal Garcia, San Diego.  
 Mary K. Hartson, Kyle.  
 E. B. Hill, Saratoga.  
 William Hotmann, Fayetteville.  
 Herman Ingenhuett, Comfort.  
 Lulu F. McManis, Baird.  
 Lucius O'Bryan, San Benito.  
 D. P. Rowland, Clyde.  
 Charley E. Smith, Kerens.  
 Henry L. Somerville, Richmond.  
 W. M. Thompson, Gilmer.  
 Gomer S. Williams, Cisco.  
 Walter S. Yates, Forney.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 16, 1910.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## BILLS ON PRIVATE CALENDAR.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Friday, January 6, 1911, be substituted for to-day for the consideration of bills in order on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] asks unanimous consent that Friday, January 6, 1911, be substituted for to-day for consideration of bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day. Is there objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suppose my colleague's request would simply make that day

the same as to-day, with no greater right, and with the same program that would come up ordinarily to-day?

Mr. PRINCE. Yes, sir. That is the purpose of substituting one day for the other.

Mr. MANN. Just as though it were to-day?

Mr. PRINCE. Just the regular day. No greater right or no different right than I would have to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 29495) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and, with the accompanying report (No. 1768), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF LATE REPRESENTATIVE COOK.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following committee, appointed yesterday, to attend the funeral of the late Representative Cook and which was to be announced this morning.

The Clerk read as follows:

HON. H. H. BINGHAM, JOHN DALZELL, GEORGE D. MCCREARY, R. O. MOON, THOMAS S. BUTLER, J. HAMPTON MOORE, ARTHUR L. BATES, D. F. LAFFAN, A. MITCHELL PALMER, J. N. LANGHAM, IRVING P. WANGER, and JOSEPH A. GOULDEN.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill (H. R. 29360); and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if I could come to some agreement with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the leading member of the minority, as to the time for general debate. On this side of the House, in order to expedite business, they are ready to dispense with general debate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have one application for 30 minutes only.

Mr. GILLET. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to 30 minutes on each side, one-half of the time to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to one hour, 30 minutes on a side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] and the other by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 29360, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

The Clerk proceeded with the first reading of the bill.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLET. Now I will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] if he will use his 30 minutes, or as much of the time as he pleases?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes, or so much thereof as they may require, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to a statement that was recently issued from the Navy Department regarding the cost of building in a Government yard one of the battleships authorized in the naval appropriation act of the current fiscal year. The statement was made to the effect that the ship will cost \$1,500,000 in excess of the limit of cost fixed by Congress. Well-informed persons in naval circles have been somewhat astonished at the statement which has been issued by the department; and if it were not for the seriousness of the situation it would be somewhat ridiculous.

It may be true, Mr. Chairman, that the cost of the battleship as planned and designed by the Navy Department will exceed the limit of cost fixed by Congress; but the ship authorized by Congress, and the only ship for which there is authority of law, can easily be built within the limits which the Congress fixed in the last appropriation act. I propose to show at this time, because the matter is now being presented to and discussed in the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the Navy Department, without authority of law, has planned and designed and has contracted for a ship of 7,000 tons greater displacement than the law authorizes.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but under the peculiar system of cost keeping now in vogue in the Navy Department, while many of the charges which are made against the cost of the ship make the apparent difference very largely in excess of what the cost should be, these charges are bookkeeping charges only, and do not exist in fact.

I have taken the trouble to set forth with some care the provisions of law covering this matter, and I shall put them in the RECORD at this time so that the Naval Committee may have the benefit of the compilation, and that the department may have an opportunity to explain its position if it be able to do so. The naval appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, approved June 24, 1910, authorized the construction of two first-class battleships to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$6,000,000.

The law provides that the battleships, and I quote the language of the law, "shall be similar to the battleship authorized by the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909."

In that act two battleships were authorized, the limit of cost of \$6,000,000 as in the act just mentioned, and that law provided that these battleships should be "similar in all essential characteristics to the battleship authorized" in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908. That act was approved March 2, 1907. One battleship was authorized in it, with a limit of cost of \$6,000,000, and the law declared it should be "similar in all essential characteristics and additional to the battleship authorized" in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1907, the plans and specifications for which, the law declares, had already been prepared and submitted to Congress as required by law.

In the act of June 29, 1906, which was the act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, a battleship was authorized "carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any known vessel of its class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest practicable radius of action, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$6,000,000;" and the law further provided that before proposals for this vessel should be issued the Secretary of the Navy should report to Congress, quoting the language of the act:

Full details covering the type of such battleship with the specifications for the same, including its displacement, draft, and dimensions, and the kind and extent of armor and armament therefor.

The battleship so authorized, Mr. Chairman, is known as the *Delaware*. Its displacement is 20,000 tons, speed 21 knots, and mean draft 26 feet 11 inches. In reply to an inquiry from Senator HALE, the Navy Department, under date of February 24, 1907, in compliance with the law requiring the plans of the battleship to be submitted to Congress for approval before proposals or bids for it could be issued, submitted the following information:

*Five hundred and ten foot battleship No. 28.*—Length on load water line, 510 feet; length over all, 518 feet 9 inches; beam molded on load water line, 84 feet 10 1/2 inches; beam over all, 85 feet 2 1/2 inches; displacement trial, 20,000 tons; displacement, fully equipped and manned (everything on board, full), 22,075 tons; draft, mean (trial displacement), 27 feet; draft, mean, fully equipped and manned (everything on board, full), 29 feet 9 inches.

Armament, main battery: Ten 12-inch B. L. R., 45 calibers. Two submerged torpedo tubes.

The ten 12-inch B. L. R. are mounted in five electrically controlled turrets on the center line, placed as follows: Two forward above the forecable deck, the second one firing over the top of the first; two aft on the main deck on the same level, and one amidships firing over the two after turrets.

The two torpedo tubes will be located forward below the water line. Secondary battery: Fourteen 5-inch R. F. G., four 3-pounder saluting guns, four 1-pounder semiauto guns, two 3-inch fieldpieces, two machine guns, 30 calibers.

The 5-inch guns are located on the gun deck, forming two broadside batteries of seven guns each, the corner guns having head and stern fire, respectively. The smaller guns are located in commanding positions with large unobstructed arcs of fire.

The following year, on March 2, 1907, a battleship additional to the *Delaware* was authorized. That vessel was named the *North Dakota*, and its speed and displacement are the same as the *Delaware*. At this point I desire to call attention to the



statement of Rear Admiral Capps, found in Senate Document No. 628, Sixtieth Congress, second session, in which it appears that the plans for the *Delaware* were prepared by a special board for two different ships, one providing for a vessel of the length of 510 feet, 20,000 tons trial displacement, 21 knots speed, and some other details, while the other plan provided for a vessel 554 feet in length, 22,000 tons trial displacement, and 22 knots speed. It appeared that after careful consideration of these two plans the board unanimously agreed upon the vessel of 510 feet length, 20,000 tons displacement. Secretary Bonaparte commented upon the plans as follows:

In accordance with the proviso attached to the last naval appropriation bill, the plans for the battleship authorized by the said bill are, simultaneously with this report, transmitted to the Congress. These plans were selected by a board of officers, under the presidency of the Assistant Secretary, after a very careful consideration of various designs submitted by different naval constructors in the United States and one in England and by the board on construction of the department. The type of vessel selected has a length of 510 feet. In the language of the board: "It will carry as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any known vessel of its class; it will have a speed which is believed to be the highest practicable for a vessel of this type and class, in the present state of knowledge; it will have the highest practicable radius of action, and can be built within the limit of cost fixed by the act of Congress." This plan, therefore, complies in all respects, in the judgment of this highly competent board, with the terms of the authorization, and the department has no hesitation in approving the report of the board.

The *North Dakota* and the *Delaware* were the first ships authorized under these provisions, and they are of 20,000 tons trial displacement.

In the act of May 13, 1908, two battleships were authorized, "similar in all characteristics to the battleships" authorized in the act of March 3, 1907. That must have been a battleship of about 20,000 tons trial displacement. The two vessels so authorized were the *Florida* and *Utah*. They are of 21,825 tons displacement, with a speed of 20.75 knots and 28 feet 6 inches mean draft, practically the same, although somewhat larger and of a trifle less speed.

In the act of March 3, 1909, two battleships were authorized, to be "similar in all essential characteristics to the battleships" authorized by the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

The ship then authorized, as already stated, was the *North Dakota*, of 20,000 tons trial displacement. The two ships so authorized, to be similar to the *North Dakota*, were named the *Arkansas* and *Wyoming*. The *Arkansas* and *Wyoming* are of 26,000 tons displacement, or 30 per cent greater displacement than the *North Dakota*, which was built upon the plans fixed by Congress, and to deviate from which there is no authority anywhere in the law.

No naval architect, Mr. Chairman, would assert for an instant that these ships, one of 20,000 tons displacement, the other of 26,000 tons displacement, were "similar in all essential characteristics." In any ship its gross displacement is a very important element; and, although the plans were submitted for the information and approval of Congress before any of these *Dreadnoughts* were authorized, the department, without authority, without any change in the law, simply upon its own initiative, has proceeded to build these vessels and expend money which was appropriated for ships of an entirely different type.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do I understand the gentleman from New York to say that the architect varied the plans agreed upon by Congress?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I mean to say that Congress approved plans in 1907 for a ship of 20,000 tons trial displacement, and the law required them to submit full details, including the displacement. Since then the law has required every battleship authorized to be similar to the one authorized by that act, and I say that the department has not only built two ships under the act of 1908 of 26,000 tons displacement, but it has let a contract for a battleship, authorized in an appropriation act for the current fiscal year, of 27,000 tons displacement, and it now asserts that a similar ship can not be built in a Government yard within the limit of cost fixed in the law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The plan for that particular battleship was not passed upon by Congress?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was passed upon in this way: That the plans for the *North Dakota* and the *Delaware* have been passed upon, and Congress has required, year after year, that the battleships authorized be the same in all essential characteristics as the *Delaware*; and I assert that nobody with any knowledge whatever of a battleship or of a naval vessel or of a merchant vessel will dare assert that a ship of 30 per cent greater displacement is similar to a smaller ship.

Mr. DAWSON. Does the gentleman intend to convey the impression that Congress did not understand when it passed the current naval appropriation act that the new ships were to be of 26,000 tons displacement?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not talking about what Congress understood. That is something that the gentleman and myself would never agree upon, as to many things. I am talking about the law which controls the department, and if the gentleman can find anything in the law which authorized it to construct vessels of essentially greater displacement than the ships passed upon by Congress, and which the gentleman's committee took particular care should be carried in the law, in authorizing these new ships, I should like to have it pointed out.

Mr. DAWSON. I will say to the gentleman that it was thoroughly understood in the Committee on Naval Affairs—in fact, a separate vote was had—as to the size and displacement of the proposed new ships, and the committee agreed that the ships should be of 26,000 tons displacement, and in other respects conform in essential characteristics to the ships heretofore authorized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is very unfortunate that the committee did not take Congress into its confidence and put into the law what they had intended to do. I know what the committee actually did. I know what the law is. I know the provision was adopted upon the recommendation of the committee of which the gentleman is a member. I do not know what they may have done in secret. I know only what they offered in public.

I know what the law is, and I know that the department can not proceed upon the theory that what is done in secret conclave in the Naval Committee is a law to control its action.

Mr. DAWSON. May I ask the gentleman one question further? If his memory serves him he will recollect that during the debate on the naval appropriation bill it was made clear to the House what the new ships were to be.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the tariff bill it was made clear in the opinion of some gentlemen, who now regret their opinion, that the tariff act would have a certain effect on the country. The country did not agree with them. What took place in debate is not binding on anybody; what takes place in the gentleman's committee is not binding on anybody. No department has a right to consult the minutes of a committee as to its authority to proceed. I am pointing out the law and I assert that if the department had been more intent on knowing the law and upon living up to it instead of devoting its energies in attempting to control the action of Congress on many matters it would not have been put in the preposterous position of obtaining authority to construct a ship of 20,000 tons displacement and then contending that a ship of 27,000 tons of trial displacement is, in all essential characteristics, the same as, or is similar to, a 20,000-ton ship.

Mr. DAWSON. Will the gentleman permit me to call his attention to the fact, and he will recollect, that the appropriations for the new ships were larger than for the previous ships, and made larger because the ships were to be larger?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me, there was no larger appropriation. There is no specific appropriation for any ships under construction. There is a lump appropriation which is apportioned as the work goes on. But I do know that the limit of cost for this 27,000-ton ship is identical with the limit of cost of the 20,000-ton ship. The gentleman may have overlooked that fact.

Mr. Chairman, before I was interrupted I was saying that the battleships authorized under the current appropriation act have been named the *New York* and the *Texas*. The law provides that they are to be—

similar to the battleships authorized in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909.

The battleships authorized in that act are the *Florida* and the *Utah*. They were to be similar to the *North Dakota* and the *Delaware*, but their displacement is 21,185 tons. Perhaps it could not be asserted that the *Florida* and *Utah* and the *Delaware* and *North Dakota* are in all essential characteristics similar, and that the variation was insignificant. No one will assert that the *Texas* and *New York*, which are planned, as my information is, to be of 27,000 tons displacement, are similar in all characteristics to the *Florida* and the *Utah*, because they are of 5,125 tons greater displacement.

Not only that; although the plans submitted for the *North Dakota* and the *Delaware* provided for 12-inch guns, the plans submitted for the *Texas* and *New York* provide for ten 14-inch guns.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that the gentleman uses the expression "similar in all essential characteristics." Is that a quotation?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; in some acts it says "similar in all essential characteristics," in some "similar in all characteristics," and in the last act "similar to;" but the displacement is not such an insignificant characteristic of a ship that the dropping of the word "essential" would make any difference. The building of a ship essential in all characteristics to some other ship, or similar to another ship, would not authorize the department to undertake to increase its size to such an extent without some indication in the law that the change was made.

The limit of cost of these battleships, exclusive of armor and armament, is \$6,000,000. So it need not be surprising that the cost of these ships will be greater than a ship of 20,000 tons displacement. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, where the Secretary of the Navy finds authority to make a contract for a 27,000-ton battleship. I do think that if the Committee on Expenditures in the Naval Department were to exercise their proper functions perhaps expenditures of this character would not be so carelessly made. The law fixes the size of these ships, and yet it must be that there is somebody under our system of government in this administration who is able to set himself above the law and above Congress and to regulate and determine the size of ships regardless of the action of Congress.

The Committee on Naval Affairs is at present, I understand, making some investigations in regard to the communications made by the Secretary of the Navy. I had a conference with the Secretary of the Navy recently, and I am expecting to obtain some information from him, but so that this statement may go out with statements that have been issued by the department I wish to state the facts as they are, so far as I have them.

The estimate for the construction of the *New York* at the navy yard is \$7,500,000. I endeavored to ascertain what the overhead charges are that are included in that estimate. I expect to get the exact figures, but it was stated that, in round numbers, they were about \$1,000,000. My information is that the statement has recently been made before the Naval Committee that the overhead charges are about 30 per cent, which would make them considerably in excess of \$1,000,000. I asked the Chief Constructor how much of this \$1,000,000 would be expended on the work being done in the yard, if the new ship were not constructed, and without investigation he hazarded the offhand information that at least \$700,000 of the \$1,000,000 would be expended, and the committee can easily understand why so much would be expended. Many of these overhead charges are merely bookkeeping charges against the ship. They have charged up the cost of repairs of buildings, the cost of maintaining the central power plant, the salaries of the naval officers in charge of the ships, and many other items, which I have not been able to obtain, all of which are paid from specific appropriations and which will be paid regardless of whether this ship is built or not.

The contract price for the *Texas*, the sister ship of the *New York*, is \$5,900,000, and this is the sum which is taken as a basis of comparison, and yet, in answer to questions, although I could not get definite information, I was assured that, in addition to the \$5,900,000, inspection charges and administrative charges necessitated by the building of this ship would not exceed \$100,000. After I had some time to think over that statement I realized how important it was that they should not exceed \$100,000, and what a safe "guess" it would be for the Naval Constructor to say under \$100,000, because if these charges exceeded \$100,000 it would bring the contract-built ship beyond the limit of cost of \$6,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, instead of there being an apparent difference of \$1,700,000 in the cost of these two ships, as the department has asserted, upon rough offhanded guessing, which of course is not figured in the interest of the Government yards, \$800,000 of the \$1,700,000 is at once eliminated.

Then there is another important matter to which no attention is given and about which the department says nothing. I am creditably informed by not one but a dozen naval constructors, and have been for years, that by the building of one of these ships in the Government yards the cost of repair work is reduced from 20 to 25 per cent. In the yard where this ship is to be built the repair work amounts to about between four and five million dollars. The saving in that alone more than wipes out the difference in the cost of these two ships. The Chief Naval Constructor, in his annual report, boasts of the fact that this country, instead of, as has been usually supposed, being slow in naval construction, can now rival any country on the face of the earth for the rapidity of naval construction, and he takes his figures from the year 1904. Yet he does not at all refer to the fact that the first of the modern ships built in Government yards was the *Connecticut*, authorized in 1902, and it and its sister ship built by contract were the first ships in

the history of the Government that were ever built within the time fixed by law. Although the time for these ships has been from 36 to 42 months, the ships invariably were from 36 to 48 months overtime in construction.

All that is desired in the discussion of these questions is that all of the facts may be laid before Congress, that Congress may have full information to determine whether the policy of utilizing great plants which are costing for maintenance and overhead charges large sums of money, regardless of how much work is done, is good policy, and that that information be given to Congress so that we may honestly determine what is the best policy and may know exactly what the result of our efforts are in this class of work. I have submitted these observations because I did not feel that I could very well intrude myself on the Naval Committee during its deliberations, but I wish to place these facts in the RECORD, so that the committee and the department may have them while this investigation is going on, and that the committee may be able to answer fully questions along these lines when the naval bill is brought to the House for consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, there is no subject before the House in which I feel a greater interest than that of pensions. The first day I occupied a seat in this body I introduced a bill to increase the pensions of Civil War soldiers, and have kept up a persistent effort for four years to secure the passage of such legislation. I believed then, as I do now, that we will never be able to pay the debt we owe to the men whose patriotic services made possible a united country. We should not forget that it was through their devotion to the flag, their fidelity, their bravery, and self-sacrifice that we now enjoy the many blessings that have been so bountifully showered upon us as a Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we of this generation, who are the beneficiaries of their loyalty and devotion, should see that the remaining years of their lives are made as happy and comfortable as possible. We should do this in order that we may show to the world that we are not an ungrateful people, but that we appreciate the gallant service they rendered. We should do this as an evidence of our gratitude and in remembrance of the hardships they endured and the sacrifices they made in behalf of liberty and justice and for the perpetuity of American institutions, and the establishment of true freedom and genuine liberty in the greatest and best Republic the world has ever known. I believed when I entered Congress four years ago that the time had come when every Union soldier who participated in that unfortunate struggle should be placed on the pension rolls at \$1 a day. During the past four years nearly 150,000 have died, and the few remaining are now dying at the rate of 1 every 13 minutes, 113 each day—43,000, I am told, died last year, and many of these actually suffered for want of the comforts of life.

Mr. Chairman, for four years I have been knocking at the door of Congress, asking that these men be given a pension of \$1 a day. Three years ago you said it was too soon after the passage of the McCumber Act to pass a general bill increasing their pensions, and then two years ago, when I insisted on the passage of a dollar-a-day bill, I was met with the argument that there was a deficit in the Government Treasury of nearly \$100,000,000, and that we had no money to pay increased pensions. Notwithstanding the condition of the Treasury, you went ahead appropriating large sums of money for other purposes, much of which was unnecessary and absolutely thrown away. During the Sixtieth Congress you created nearly 15,000 new offices and fixed large salaries until the salaries of the new officers, together with the increases, amounted to nearly \$30,000,000, and then you said to the old soldier, "You must wait until the Treasury is replenished."

One year ago I again urged the passage of my dollar-a-day bill, but you once more turned a deaf ear to the appeal of the old soldier and appropriated over a billion dollars for other purposes, but none to increase the pensions of the men who spent the best years of their lives in defending the flag. You have persistently refused to consolidate the 18 pension agencies, as is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions, and by so doing save annually over \$400,000, which should be paid to the old soldiers in the way of increased pensions. The failure of Congress to enact legislation that will do justice to the survivors of the Civil War has been a great disappointment to me, but I have the satisfaction of knowing that I have been loyal and faithful to my soldier constituency and have made the best effort I could toward re-



warding them for the patriotic service they rendered in behalf of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, while I regret the committee has not seen fit to report the bill I introduced to pension soldiers at \$1 a day, I am nevertheless glad that they have reported a bill based on age, which, if enacted into law, will distribute over \$45,000,000 among worthy soldiers in addition to what they are now drawing. The bill I refer to is known as H. R. 29346, and reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 29346) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late Civil War, or 60 days in the War with Mexico, and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and who has reached the age of 62 years or over, shall, upon making proof of such facts according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the pension roll and be entitled to receive a pension as follows: In case such person has reached the age of 62 years, \$15 per month; 65 years, \$20 per month; 70 years, \$25 per month; 75 years or over, \$36 per month; and such pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage and approval of this act: *Provided*, That pensioners who are 62 years of age or over, and who are now receiving pensions under existing laws, or whose claims are pending in the Bureau of Pensions, may, by application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act; and nothing herein contained shall prevent any pensioner or person entitled to a pension from prosecuting his claim and receiving a pension under any other general or special act: *Provided further*, That no person shall receive a pension under any other law at the same time or for the same period that he is receiving a pension under the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That no person who is now receiving or shall hereafter receive a greater pension under any other general or special law than he would be entitled to receive under the provisions herein shall be pensionable under this act.

Sec. 2. That the benefits of this act shall include any person who served the period of time therein specified during the late Civil War or in the War with Mexico, and who is now or may hereafter become entitled to pension under the acts of June 27, 1890, February 15, 1895, and the joint resolutions of July 1, 1902, and June 28, 1906, or the acts of January 29, 1887, March 3, 1891, February 17, 1897, February 6, 1907, and March 4, 1907.

Sec. 3. That rank in the service shall not be considered in applications filed hereunder.

Sec. 4. That no pension attorney, claim agent, or other person shall be entitled to receive any compensation for services rendered in presenting any claim to the Bureau of Pensions or securing any pension.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, provides a pension of \$15 per month for all soldiers between the ages of 62 and 65; a pension of \$20 per month for all soldiers between the ages of 65 and 70; a pension of \$25 per month for all soldiers between the ages of 70 and 75; and a pension of \$36 per month for all soldiers who have reached the age of 75 years or more. There are now on the pension rolls 93,589 Civil War soldiers between the ages of 62 and 65, whose pensions will be increased under this bill \$36 per year, making a total increase to this number of \$3,369,204. There are now on the rolls 184,577 Civil War soldiers between the ages of 65 and 70, whose pensions will be increased under this bill \$96 per year, or a total increase of \$17,719,392. There are now on the rolls 101,778 Civil War soldiers between the ages of 70 and 75, whose pensions will be increased, if this bill becomes a law, \$120 per year, a total increase of \$12,213,350. There are now on the rolls 63,461 Civil War soldiers who are between the ages of 75 and 108, whose pensions will be increased \$192 per year, a total increase to this number of \$12,187,512. It will be observed, therefore, that the total number of Civil War pensioners on the rolls at this time, exclusive of widows, minors, and dependent children, is 443,405, and the total increase under this bill to them amounts to \$45,489,468. In addition to this there are 2,910 Mexican War soldiers, who, unless they are already on the rolls at a higher rate, will be benefited by this bill as follows: There are 27 on the rolls between the ages of 70 and 75, whose pensions will be increased \$120 per year, making a total increase of \$3,240; there are 2,883 Mexican War soldiers now on the rolls over the age of 75 years, whose pensions will be increased under this bill \$192 per year, making a total of \$553,536. Add to this the total increase to Civil War soldiers under the bill and you have a total increase to both Mexican and Civil War soldiers of \$46,046,244. In view of the fact that some are already on the rolls at a higher rate than that fixed in this bill, the total increase may be a little less than the amount stated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I preferred the straight dollar-a-day bill to the one reported, I am nevertheless going to give this bill my hearty and enthusiastic support. As I have already shown, it will distribute over \$45,000,000 among worthy soldiers, and this vast sum of money will add much to their comfort. While the bill, in my judgment, is not what it should be and not what I would have made it, yet I appreciate the fact that practically all legislation is the result of a compromise, and that a half loaf is better than none. In view of this fact, I shall vote for the bill, and in doing so I feel that the fight I have made during the past four years for more liberal pensions for

the old soldiers has not been in vain. I sincerely hope this bill will pass, and then later on I will urge the passage of a dollar-a-day bill for the benefit of those who are on the rolls at a less rate.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I will occupy but a very few minutes in giving to the House my views on this legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. To me this appropriation bill is the most uninteresting and most unsatisfactory of all the appropriation bills. It deals almost exclusively, as the House is aware, with the salaries and contingent expenses of the different departments, questions which are not intrinsically of great interest, and it is unsatisfactory because in determining these salaries and funds we are obliged, of course, to take the statements of the officials who come before us. Now, in many departments the officials are enthusiastic and energetic. They can see great opportunities for new usefulness if the money at their disposal is increased. That, of course, is a commendable disposition, and yet, if we should allow the enthusiasm of all the well-meaning officials in the departments to have free rein, the Government would soon be in bankruptcy. It is necessary for the committee to decide where we shall restrict and where we shall be liberal, and we also find that in some of the departments there are officials whom we think do not exercise as close scrutiny and have as good and economical an organization as they ought to, and there we try to restrict their appropriation. The House will recognize that in all these cases we are obliged to take the statements of the officials who come before us. We can not go up into the departments and sit down and see just what is being done; and although from year to year we gradually form an opinion of their trustworthiness as the different heads come before us, and in our appropriations are influenced by that opinion, yet after all it is a great deal guesswork, and there is no principle or line by which we can hew and determine when an appropriation should be granted and when refused, so that this bill is obliged to be more or less a determination without complete knowledge as to just what each department should get. Therefore, I say it is always somewhat unsatisfactory.

Now, this pending bill has, I think, less in it to excite the interest or criticism of the House than any bill with which I have been connected, unless it was the bill of last year. There is certainly in the departments a spirit of economy which we have not noticed until last year. The Treasury Department particularly is bringing out new methods and suggests new organizations and new economies which are most gratifying. The House will remember that last year we gave to the Treasury Department, at their suggestion, an appropriation of \$75,000 to be expended in employing experts to suggest to them new business methods in that department. We think that money has been admirably expended, and that it was a good investment. This year the Treasury Department itself—last year, you may remember, it cut down its expenses about \$300,000—goes still further and cuts them down about \$250,000 more, and that is the department where there is the greatest mark of improvement. Whether this is because that department was worse before and there is not so much room for reorganization in the other departments I can not say, but they certainly have evinced a wonderful zeal and efficiency in the reorganization in the department.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have not had time to carefully read the report, as I have only received it this morning, but I notice you state on page 30 the net decrease in the number of salaries carried in this bill under appropriations for 1911 is 237. Can the gentleman tell us the number of increases in the bill now under consideration?

Mr. GILLET. The number of increases of salary? I can not, but I should say as a mere guess it would be about 20.

Mr. GOULDEN. Twenty only?

Mr. GILLET. Yes; I should think so, but that is a mere guess.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has the gentleman the amount of increases in the salaries proposed under this bill?

Mr. GILLET. I should guess, probably—and, as I say, this must be only a guess—my recollection of them is it would be a \$10,000 or \$15,000 increase.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. GILLET. We have increased a few salaries. I do not think it is necessary to take up the time now to detail the changes, because as we come along and reach each case there will be ample time to explain it if the House so desires, and I do not think the entire matter is of such importance and interest that it requires me to take the time now in general debate to explain

when under the five-minute debate that will be sufficient, so unless some gentleman wishes to make an inquiry—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not know whether or not I shall wish to take up this matter under the five-minute rule. If the chairman of the committee can make a satisfactory explanation now probably I shall content myself. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill abolishes the assay office at St. Louis, and I believe it also abolishes several other assay offices.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. One other—in North Carolina.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My information is that at the assay office at St. Louis about \$100,000 worth of business was done last year in actual assays, at an expense of \$4,700. The assay office is located in a Federal building; they pay no rent, no special expense for fuel, and, as a result of that arrangement, this assay office has been maintained at a very small expense to the Government, and the benefits of it have been great to the people who do business with the office. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether, in his judgment, \$100,000 worth of business, especially small business—these assays amount probably to \$10 to \$25 each, and for those \$100,000 probably 10,000 assays will have to be made—could be done any more economically, either at a mint or anywhere else, than is done at the present time at St. Louis? If he can satisfy me on that point, and if I can also receive a satisfactory answer to my inquiry as to whether that amount of gold which is now offered by jewelers to these small assay offices would ever go into any mint at all, in that case I would not offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I regret exceedingly, and I am sure the committee agrees with me, to take away from the gentleman's home an office which, of course, is somewhat a matter of pride to him. We all of us regret to have any office removed from our own districts, and I regret to take one away from such a distinguished gentleman as my friend from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I thank you.

Mr. GILLET. But this was one of the economies which the Treasury Department, in its genuine zeal for reorganization and economy, pressed upon us. Now, the facts about St. Louis are as follows: As the gentleman states, they did nearly a million dollars worth of business—\$723,000 worth. I am referring to the year 1910.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the gentleman will permit me, according to the statement of Mr. Andrew before your committee, the St. Louis assay office received \$100,000 in deposits in the course of the year for assay purposes.

Mr. GILLET. I have here the statement of Mr. Andrew, in which they received \$723,000; but call it a million dollars. It makes no difference in the principle. It consisted of 38,900 ounces of gold. Now, what did that gold consist of? Of that 38,000 ounces, 16,000 ounces and a little over were United States coin which was brought there. That did not need to be brought to St. Louis. It could just as well have been deposited in a subtreasury anywhere. The reason why it was shipped to St. Louis from Cincinnati and near points was that if it had been sent on to Philadelphia the Government would have had to pay the freight. It was a little easier for the shippers to ship it to St. Louis and put the expense of getting it to the mint onto the Government than it was to send it to Philadelphia themselves. It made very little difference to them. It made a great difference to the Government.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Has the gentleman any figures to show how many ounces of gold were offered that were not in the shape of coins?

Mr. GILLET. I was going to say that of the 38,000 ounces, there were 19,000 ounces which were simply domestic bullion. Now, those were in bars of gold which were sent there from other refiners. They were deposited in St. Louis. They might have been deposited in any subtreasury just as well and been sent on. Now, 19,000 ounces consisted of domestic bullion, so that 35,000 ounces of the 38,000 were either of United States coin which was short weight, or else refined bars ready for minting. Now, neither of those, of course, needed to go to an assay office, so really the great bulk of it was sent there because, as I understand, the director worked for it. I do not blame him for it, but he was energetic, and he persuaded some of it to be sent there and, I suspect, from what I learned, in order to increase the business.

It is very proper to say that it is not of any advantage to the Government. There are 35,000 ounces out of the 38,000 ounces that could have been just as well sent anywhere else as to the St. Louis assay office. It was really of no advantage to the Government.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That would leave about \$100,000, of which I spoke, and the other \$650,000 was gold upon which no

assay was necessary. The \$100,000, then, of which Mr. Andrew speaks, comprised small articles brought to that office for assaying by jewelers, and so forth; and, in my judgment, none of this would have found its way back to the Government Treasury but for the existence of that assay office, and there can be no doubt but that it is convenient to the people to have an assay office in the locality for assaying and purchasing their gold.

Mr. GILLET. Yes; there were these 2,355 ounces of old jewelry, I agree with the gentleman, that would naturally go to the assay office; and that is really what the assay office does. It does not seem to me that an assay office ought to be kept up for the refining of 2,355 ounces of old jewelry.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My contention is that if you had the assaying of the same amount anywhere else it would cost as much money.

Mr. GILLET. I claim that it is not necessary to keep up a separate establishment for such a small amount of work.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to stand here every year and fight for the purpose of continuing that assay office. If the Treasury Department and its experts have come to the conclusion that the purposes of true reform will be subserved by abolishing that office at St. Louis, I am willing to give them a chance to demonstrate such to be the fact. For that reason I shall not offer an amendment to the bill to continue that office.

Mr. MANN. You are a true patriot.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Secretary: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of the contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; hire of horse and wagon for the Secretary's office, \$420; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,250; financial clerk, \$3,000, and \$1,250 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; minute and journal clerk, and enrolling clerk, at \$3,000 each; principal clerk, executive clerk, and assistant financial clerk, at \$2,750 each; reading clerk, librarian, chief bookkeeper, and clerk, compiling a history of revenue and general appropriation bills, at \$2,500 each; compiler of Navy Yearbook and indexer for Senate public documents, Pitman Pulsifer, \$3,500; keeper of stationery, \$2,400; 4 clerks, at \$2,220 each; 5 clerks, at \$2,100 each; assistant librarian, \$2,000; assistant librarian, \$1,800; assistant librarian, \$1,600; skilled laborer, \$1,200; clerk, \$1,800; clerk, \$1,600; assistant keeper of stationery, \$1,800; assistant in stationery room, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,440; assistant messenger, \$1,200; 6 laborers, at \$720 each; in all, \$88,910.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language used in lines 6 and 7, concluding in line 8, page 3:

Compiler of Navy Yearbook and indexer for Senate public documents, Pitman Pulsifer, \$3,500.

That appears to be new language in an appropriation bill, and I would like to have an explanation of it, if it does not change existing law.

Mr. GILLET. Although an apparently new provision, it is not. It was in the sundry civil bill of last year, and we have simply carried it from the sundry civil bill. It really belongs to this bill, as the gentleman will recognize.

Mr. MACON. Is the appropriation authorized by existing law?

Mr. GILLET. It was authorized by the sundry civil appropriation bill; it was from the Senate.

Mr. MACON. It was simply carried in an appropriation bill?

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman will recognize that many of these Senate and House appropriations have no foundation except in appropriation bills. This was intended as a permanent appropriation for the Senate, and they wish it again this year.

Mr. MACON. What is the importance of this office?

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman could hardly expect me to judge of the importance of many of the Senate positions. We in the House generally allow the Senate to decide for itself what positions it needs, and put them in, and they give us the same privilege. We simply put it in because the Senate requested it.

Mr. MACON. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks and messengers to committees: Clerk of printing records, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$4,000; two assistant clerks, at \$2,500 each; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; clerk and stenographer to the Committee on Finance, \$3,000; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Claims, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,000; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$900; clerk to the Committee on Commerce, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Pensions, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,440 each; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$900; clerk to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, \$2,500; 3 assistant clerks, at \$1,440 each; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on the District of Columbia, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Foreign Relations, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Engrossed Bills, \$2,220; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Joint Committee on the Library, \$2,500;



messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Naval Affairs, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Indian Affairs, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,440; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Public Lands, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, \$2,500; messenger, \$1,440; clerk to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,440; clerks to the Committees on the Census, Education and Labor, Territories, Public Health and National Quarantine, Private Land Claims, Patents, Coast Defenses, Privileges and Elections, Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, Rules, Civil Service and Retrenchment, Enrolled Bills, Geological Survey, Railroads, Pacific Railroads, Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, Philippines, Cuban Relations, Inter-oceanic Canals, Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, Mississippi River and its Tributaries, Expenditures in the Department of State, Manufactures, University of the United States, Canadian Relations, Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, Woman Suffrage, Mines and Mining, to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, Revolutionary Claims, Immigration, Fisheries, Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, Coast and Insular Survey, Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, Indian Depredations, Industrial Expositions, to Investigate Trespassers on Indian Lands, Standards, Weights, and Measures, Disposition of Useless Papers in Executive Departments, Expenditures in the Treasury Department, Expenditures in the War Department, Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, Expenditures in the Interior Department, Expenditures in the Department of Justice, Expenditures in the Navy Department, Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, Conservation of National Resources, and clerk to the Conference Minority of the Senate, 51 in all, at \$2,220 each; assistant clerks to the Committees on Private Land Claims, Rules, Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, Philippines, and Conference Minority of the Senate, 5 in all, at \$1,800 each; assistant clerks to the Committees on Education and Labor, Territories, Public Health and National Quarantine, Coast Defenses, Privileges and Elections, Enrolled Bills, Cuban Relations, Inter-oceanic Canals, Manufactures, Immigration, and Fisheries, 11 in all, at \$1,440 each; messengers to the Committees on the Census, Territories, Patents, Privileges and Elections, Additional Accommodations for the Library, Rules, Civil Service and Retrenchment, Geological Survey, Railroads, Pacific Railroads, Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, Philippines, Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, Mississippi River and its Tributaries, Expenditures in the Department of State, Manufactures, University of the United States, Canadian Relations, Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, Woman Suffrage, Mines and Mining, to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, Revolutionary Claims, Immigration, Fisheries, Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, Coast and Insular Survey, Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, Indian Depredations, Industrial Expositions, to Investigate Trespassers on Indian Lands, Standards and Measures, Disposition of Useless Papers in Executive Departments, Expenditures in the Treasury Department, Expenditures in the War Department, Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, Expenditures in the Interior Department, Expenditures in the Department of Justice, Expenditures in the Navy Department, Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and Conservation of National Resources, 43 in all, at \$1,440 each; in all, \$315,420.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I offer a formal amendment, inserting a word which was forgotten.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 21, after the word "standards," insert the word "weights."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; horse and wagon for his use, \$420, or so much thereof as may be necessary; clerk to Sergeant at Arms, \$2,500; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,592; acting assistant doorkeeper, \$2,592; 3 messengers, acting as assistant doorkeepers, at \$1,800 each; 48 messengers, at \$1,440 each; 2 messengers on the floor of the Senate, at \$2,000 each; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the official reporters, \$2,000; storekeeper, \$1,800; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,440; cabinetmaker, \$1,200; 3 carpenters, at \$1,080 each; janitor, \$1,200; 4 skilled laborers, at \$1,000 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$840; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring room, at \$720 each; chief telephone operator, \$1,200; 2 telephone operators, at \$900 each; night telephone operator, \$720; telephone page, \$720; superintendent of press gallery, \$1,600; assistant superintendent of press gallery, \$1,200; 2 laborers, at \$840 each; 30 laborers, at \$720 each; 16 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$2.50 per day each during the session, \$8,400; in all, \$151,724.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "five hundred dollars," in line 11, page 9, it being an increase of salary to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I will explain to the gentleman that this was in the deficiency bill of the current year, for an additional amount paid the clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, \$2,500 for the fiscal year, which was an addition of \$500.

Mr. MACON. It has been carried in an appropriation bill in that form, which, of course, fixes the salary.

Mr. GILLET. Which fixes the salary.

Mr. MACON. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the following for Senate Office Building under the Sergeant at Arms, namely: Stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and keeper of furniture records, \$1,200; 5 messengers, at \$1,440 each; attendant in charge of bathing rooms, \$1,800; 2 attendants in bathing rooms, at \$720 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, at \$720 each; janitor for bathing rooms, \$720; 3 messengers, acting

as mail carriers, at \$1,200 each; and messenger for service to the press correspondents, \$900; in all, \$14,700.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the item in line 21, page 10.

Attendant in charge of bathing rooms, \$1,800.

That seems to be the creation of a new office.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, exactly the same explanation applies to that. It was in the same deficiency bill. It is on page 422 of the printed volume—

For attendant in charge of bathing rooms of the Senate Office Building, at the rate of \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. MACON. It is carried in a previous appropriation bill.

Mr. GILLET. Yes; not the legislative bill, but the deficiency bill. That is the reason it is new in this bill. It is transferred from the deficiency bill to this bill.

Mr. MACON. This is the bill I am investigating, and I have not the other before me, so will have to accept the gentleman's statement about the matter.

Mr. GILLET. Exactly. We transferred it from the deficiency bill to this bill, where it obviously belongs.

Mr. MACON. With that explanation, Mr. Chairman, I take it that the point of order will not lie, and so I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to maintain that because an appropriation is carried in any previous appropriation bill, that makes it authorized by law? As I understand the rule of this House and the rulings which have been made upon it, the mere appropriation in previous appropriation bills will not make it law unless it is fixed by some statute or resolution. The mere fact that an appropriation is carried for an office or for any other purpose does not make it an appropriation authorized by law so as not to be thereafter subject to a point of order as not authorized by law.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any organic law as to any of the employees of the Senate or of the House.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. Many of them are authorized by law.

Mr. GILLET. At any rate the ruling has been that any employee of the Senate or of the House who has been carried in any previous appropriation bill is thereby part of the force of the two Houses, and the appropriation for the salary is in order on any subsequent appropriation bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Before even the clerks of the committees in this House can be provided for in an appropriation bill, the gentleman's committee ordinarily will not appropriate for a clerk to a committee or any other officer of this House unless authorized either by statute or by some resolution of the House, which is equivalent, being an authorization under the rules of the House. I am not disposed to make points of order against employees of the Senate. I think the salary paid in this instance is extravagant, and the Senate must take the responsibility of this kind of employment; and I could not remain silent and acquiesce in the proposition that the gentleman from Massachusetts made, and which seemed to be accepted by the gentleman from Arkansas, that whenever you reach an item of appropriation for an office or a salary carried in a previous appropriation bill or deficiency bill, that that makes it sacred against a point of order, on the ground that it is authorized by law.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman, it seems to me, does not distinguish between employees of the House and Senate and other employees of the Government.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Oh, yes; I do.

Mr. GILLET. Because the gentleman says it has to be carried by a House resolution. Now, this was carried by the Senate. The Senate enacted it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The Senate did not authorize it anywhere, except in an appropriation bill.

Mr. GILLET. The Senate authorized it, and, therefore, why does not that place it on all fours with a House item authorized by the House?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The rule of the House is that any item in an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order when you can show that it is not authorized by existing law or is new legislation; and the mere fact that the Senate has, at a previous time or on a previous appropriation bill, provided for an office or for an expenditure does not change the rule; else all anyone would have to do would be to have the Senate incorporate as an amendment to an appropriation bill something desired to carry in the House, and then when it came back next year it could be appropriated for, and it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. GILLET. That simply applies to Senate positions. Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. But these Senate positions must be authorized by law.

Mr. GILLET. They are authorized by resolution of the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. This does not appear to be authorized by resolution.

Mr. GILLET. It was authorized by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Oh, but that is different. It is authorized by a vote on an appropriation bill. I take it that it is not authorized by a resolution of the Senate, which is often done when they create new offices. The record is full now of such cases, but I, for one, will not acquiesce in a proposition that the Senate, by writing into an appropriation bill, can create a new office which forever becomes an office.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Except for the rulings which have been made by the Chair that a House resolution authorizing a position shall then have a position on an appropriation bill, the gentleman would not contend that a resolution passed by this House providing for an additional employee was law beyond the existence of that House itself?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. No. I said under the ruling of the House it had been determined on an appropriation bill that a resolution authorizing the establishment of an office in this House was not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Although the House itself had expired by limitation of its term.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I did not say that.

Mr. MANN. That is the ruling, because you find all through reference to old resolutions passed in a prior Congress by the House of Representatives, not law, because this House can not by simple resolution enact a law which continues to be valid after the expiration of that Congress; and yet uniform rulings have been made by the Chair—strained, probably, to begin with, but now precedents—that where the House by resolution makes a provision for another employee of the House or an increase of salary for the employee, it is a warrant for continuing the appropriation and the item in an appropriation bill for that place. And the same ruling has gone to where the provision is made in an appropriation bill, because an appropriation bill which is a law is considered to have as much force as a simple resolution of the House which is not law and can not be law after the House has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think the gentleman is mistaken in his statement that rulings have been uniform that a mere carrying of a provision in an appropriation bill not authorized by law or by resolution prevents a point of order from being made against it.

Mr. MANN. There is no logic in the ruling, but there was the ruling and there has been practice and precedents, and they probably have worked to the extent of increasing the employees and their salaries.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. It is very embarrassing to make a point of order to a proposition like this, and I would not have been heard at all except that I did not want to accept as a precedent the fact that the mere carrying in an appropriation bill of an item like this, which has never been authorized by law or by resolution of either House, was authority at law for continuing it in an appropriation bill. I do not believe that is good legislation.

Mr. MANN. It may not be good logic, but if the House passed a simple resolution creating a position, and that is in order on an appropriation bill, then if the Senate does the same thing that would be in order if the Senate, by simple resolution, can provide for a place.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, these resolutions are always provided, both in the House and the Senate, to be paid out of the contingent fund until otherwise provided for by law. And the reason that the ruling was made that a simple resolution of the House providing for the creation of a new office at a salary to be paid out of the contingent fund was that the House had absolute control, under the statute, of the contingent fund and that it was not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I would not undertake to correct the gentleman about resolutions that come from his own committee, because I know that he is thoroughly informed about those matters as well as others; but I think, as a rule, the resolutions that come from the Committee on Accounts only provide that they are to be paid out of the contingent fund, without any regard as to how they shall be paid after that.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman is in error about that, for a great many have the provision "until otherwise provided for by law."

Mr. MANN. If the Senate, by some resolution, can make in order an item in an appropriation bill, certainly by enacting a law the two Houses can do it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. That is the logic of the situation, and I think that has been the ruling.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel disposed to make the point of order. I reserved it merely to say what I have on the point of order. I therefore withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks to Senators: For 35 annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at \$2,000 each, \$70,000.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. This provides for 35 annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at \$2,000 each, in all \$70,000. The clerks there provided for, as I understand it, are the same clerks that we call our secretary, who get \$125 a month.

Mr. GILLET. That is true.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. In other words, the clerks to the Senators under this bill are provided for at a compensation of \$2,000 a year to perform the same duties that the secretaries to Members perform for \$1,500 a year.

Mr. GILLET. That is a fact.

Mr. DAWSON. And if the gentleman from Georgia will permit me, I desire to say that I think the secretaries to Members of the House perform more onerous and responsible and detail duties than do the clerks to the Senators.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I did not speak as yet of the extent of the work, but I spoke of the character of it.

Mr. DAWSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, as he knows I do. Now, I would ask the gentleman, Did not the act creating the position, or authorizing the appropriation for clerks to Representatives—I think it was in 1891 or 1893—

Mr. GILLET. It was later than that, I think.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Well, it was for the session in 1891 or 1893. In 1896 provision was made that it be annual at \$100 a month, and then it was increased to \$125 a month. Now, there could be no clerk either to a Senator or to a Member of the House of Representatives unless there was some law for it. When did this discrepancy in the amount paid to the clerks to Senators and to Representatives arise?

Mr. GILLET. I think there has been a discrepancy from the beginning, but not as much as this. The gentleman is undoubtedly familiar with the fact that nearly all those holding positions under the Senate receive higher salaries for the same position than they do in the House.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. Elevator conductors, messengers, and so forth. The Senate pays more than the House does for the performance of what is supposed to be the same service.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes; but the gentleman must admit that there was no authority for Senators or Representatives to have a secretary or a clerk, either annually or by the session, until some 12 or 15 years ago.

Mr. GILLET. I think it was about 1895.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think the gentleman is correct about that. Then, surely, an act which received the approval of the House and the Senate did not provide that the clerk to a Representative should receive \$1,500 or \$1,200 and a clerk to a Senator \$2,000. The point I am trying to get at is, when and how was this discrepancy created?

[The time of Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia having expired, by unanimous consent he was granted five minutes more.]

Mr. GILLET. My recollection is this, that the first law allowed \$6 a day.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That was for the session.

Mr. GILLET. Then they were put on a salary of \$1,200 a year. Then the Senate, with the usual opinion that they should have more in that body, fixed the salary of their clerks at \$1,500 a year. Then we raised ours to \$1,500, and they raised theirs to \$1,800, and last session they raised theirs to \$2,000.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. They did it on an appropriation bill.



Mr. GILLETT. I think it has been on an appropriation bill since the beginning—since the very first one.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. No; there was an act passed authorizing this.

Mr. GILLETT. It is the only law now, and allows a Member \$100 a month; everything else has been done by appropriation.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. By resolution passed, if I recollect it—a concurrent or joint resolution. Anyhow, the point I wanted to emphasize was that these clerks to these Senators not only get \$2,000 a year, but they are on the roll of the Senate, and they get what is usually termed in every Congress the extra month's pay.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Making it nearly \$2,200.

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly; and the gentleman probably is aware that this question has been agitated to put our clerks on the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. And there is where they ought to go.

Mr. GILLETT. I agree with the gentleman; I think so, but the point of order was raised against it. I agree with the gentleman on that, and I think they ought to be on the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think clerks to Members ought to be upon the roll. I do not mean to say that Members should be stripped of their power or authority to designate a clerk and put him upon the roll and he should remain there regardless of the wishes of the Representative, but I do say the clerk should be designated by the Member, placed upon the roll, and should remain there as long as it is the wish and pleasure of the Representative for whom the work is performed, as long as he shall be his secretary. I understand that the reason there is objection made to this proposition to put clerks of the Members of the House upon the roll is that Members find it necessary to have more than one clerk. I am very willing to permit them to name one or as many as they see fit to do, but what ought to be done is that the money appropriated for this service ought to be paid by the disbursing officer to the clerk and not to be sent to the Member and then disbursed by him. I do not believe the statements I have seen in the newspapers, for statements have been made that Members sometimes, I will not say often, I trust no Member does it—but we have seen it frequently in the newspapers that Representatives employ clerks at \$50 a month and pay them that and do not pay all the amount that is appropriated. I do not believe there is any such instance, but in order to prevent any such suggestion, in order to do what is proper and right, these clerks ought to go upon the roll of the House as employees of the House and be paid for their services, because it is not to the Representative that they render their service, but it is for the benefit of his constituents that they are appointed, and they ought to be paid like other employees of the Government, by the Government on the roll.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MACON. I want to ask the gentleman, What is the necessity for putting a clerk to a Representative on the roll?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Just as much a necessity as putting a clerk to a Senator on the roll, and they are on the roll.

Mr. MACON. I do not think that was necessary.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think it is the proper thing to do.

Mr. GILLETT. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman? Why does not his committee, which is the proper committee, having such matters in charge, bring in such a resolution?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I think we will. We have done it, and we will do it again, if I can have my way about it.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. First, I want to answer the interrogatory of the gentleman from Arkansas. It seems to me that a man who is provided by law to render a public service ought to be on the rolls of the Government; he ought to be on the pay roll. The clerk to a Member of the House of Representatives is performing the same character of service as a clerk to a committee, and there is as much reason why he should be on the roll as the clerk of any committee of the House or Senate. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have introduced into the House a bill and a resolution covering the point which the gentleman from Georgia has alluded to here. I have been convinced for many years that a serious injustice was being done by the present practice to one of the most efficient corps of Government employees that there is in the city of Washington.

Having served, myself, as a private secretary to a Member of this House, I am somewhat familiar with his duties. In my judgment, the success of a Member of this House in the eyes of his constituents at home depends as largely upon the effi-

ciency of his private secretary as it does upon any other one thing.

Now, these private secretaries at the present time—and the same has been true for a number of years past—have not been either flesh, fish, nor fowl. They have not been even good red herring, so far as having a status is concerned. They are not recognized as employees of the Government at all. It has been customary for the newspapers to speak of this \$1,500 allowance annually for clerk hire as a contingent fund for the Members of the House of Representatives.

These secretaries, and I repeat it, are among the most useful and most efficient young men in the Government service anywhere. Most of them are married men who come here from the districts represented by their respective Members. They are performing a service of unusual value, not only to the Members themselves but to the constituencies represented by those Members. It seems to me that this injustice ought not to be allowed to continue any longer, and I hope that before this session of Congress closes we will bring in for the consideration of the House either a bill or a resolution to put this corps of young men on a proper foundation, where they should have been many years ago.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I understand your remarks, you favor making them employees and putting them on the roll?

Mr. DAWSON. I favor putting them on the roll and giving them a status; yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. What will be the effect of that so far as the control of a Member over his secretary is concerned?

Mr. DAWSON. Under the resolution I have drawn there will be no limitation as to the rights of a Member either in changing his secretary at any time or allowing him to designate two to perform the work if he chooses.

Mr. SHERLEY. How would it be possible, then, to have them on the rolls?

Mr. DAWSON. Why would it not be possible?

Mr. SHERLEY. The roll contemplates an employee who is employed at a given salary for a stated period.

Mr. DAWSON. Yes; but if provision is made for \$1,500 or \$1,800 per year, and it is specified in the law that there may be designated one or two persons up to that limit of salary, I see no reason why that would not be entirely possible and entirely practicable.

Mr. SHERLEY. And you could change the designation at any time?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERLEY. How are the payments to be made? On the designation of the Members?

Mr. DAWSON. The payments are to be made to the person whose name appears on the roll.

Mr. SHERLEY. Suppose you desire to change your secretary in the middle of a month, what then? How would the payment be made?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Wait until the end of the month.

Mr. MANN. There is no difficulty as to that, I will say. Under the existing practice the chairman of a committee names the secretary of the committee, and can at any time designate a new secretary to take the place of a secretary which he has. It not only can be done, but it is sometimes done at the end of the month and sometimes in the middle of a month.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not think there are any difficulties that would in any way hamper the administration of such a resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Dawson] has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. What advantage is there for the clerk of a Member to go on the rolls unless it be to increase the salary?

Mr. DAWSON. There is a great deal of advantage.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, what?

Mr. DAWSON. As I said before, these are self-respecting young men, and they have a right to appear as something in this governmental scheme of ours.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not think titles make substance, does he?

Mr. DAWSON. No.

Mr. SHERLEY. "A man's a man for a' that."

Mr. DAWSON. But these are young men of character and self-respect, and rightfully entitled to go on the rolls of this House.

Mr. SHERLEY. They certainly do not lose anything in self-respect by being secretaries of Congressmen; I hope the gentleman does not have such a poor opinion of his colleagues as that.

Mr. DAWSON. Not at all. But they keenly feel the difference between being employed under a contingent fund and occupying an office where they rightfully belong. They should go on the annual roll, because they are annual employees.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, is the object to give them a title, or is he looking toward an increase in salary?

Mr. DAWSON. I think they ought to have both.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, the gentleman discusses a different proposition.

Mr. DAWSON. There is nothing concealed about this at all. They are entitled both to this status and entitled to be placed on a reasonable parity at least with the Senate. Now, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON. Will the gentleman be kind enough to give the committee his reasons why this should not be done?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will tell you the reason why I believe they should not be put on the roll. The relationship of a secretary with a Member is a peculiarly confidential one, one that should be subject to the absolute control of a Member. I would not have any man as my secretary whom I might not dismiss at any moment, without being required to give the reason that actuated me. Now, if a man considers being simply my secretary is a position so lacking in dignity that he is not willing to serve without giving him some title, he is not the kind of man I want.

Mr. DAWSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him whether it is not a fact that every one of the heads of the departments and many of the heads of bureaus have private secretaries who occupy the same confidential relations as the private secretary of a Member of Congress, and whether he would be in favor of appropriating to the head of a department a lump sum from which he might fix the salary of his private secretary, or whether it would not be better business administration to specify the position and the amount in the law?

Mr. SHERLEY. I see no objection on earth, where we allow a private secretary to the head of a department and where the secretary assumes the same relation as he does to the Congressman, that the head of the department should have absolute control of that man.

Mr. DAWSON. Does not the gentleman admit that that would be very loose legislation, which would give opportunity for abuses of it?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not. I have no objection to any sort of arrangement, if the gentleman has such a poor opinion of his colleagues as to think it is necessary, whereby we will guarantee that the money allowed is paid to the secretary.

Mr. DAWSON. The gentleman is arguing against all that he has contended for in this House as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is welcome to that conclusion.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I asked the gentleman from Georgia a while ago the necessity for putting clerks to Congressmen upon the roll, and he could not give me the necessity therefor. Therefore, if there is no necessity for it, I can not see any reason why there should be a change made. There ought to be a necessity for every character of legislation that this House engages in. We ought not to legislate simply to please some whim of some one who may happen to occupy confidential relations to Members of this House.

I am opposed to putting the clerks of Representatives upon the roll. I have had a clerk ever since I have been a Member of Congress, and every month I indorse to him the check that I receive, and allow him to draw his \$125 in person. The money does not find even a temporary lodgment in my pocket. If every Congressman will do that, why should there be any necessity for changing the relations that exist between the Congressman and his clerk?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman to say that I have never collected one of those checks in my life, and I have been here 16 years?

Mr. MACON. I thought so.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I have never collected even one.

Mr. MACON. Then what is the necessity for making this change? Now, sometimes it happens that unpleasant relations arise between Representatives and their clerks. That has happened to me during only one session of Congress since I have been a Member of it. I was then so unfortunate as to get upon my hands a young man who lost his head when he got to Washington. He was a nice young man at home, but the influences that surrounded him here carried him off his feet, and he got

to be absolutely useless to me. I could not find him during the day. I looked for him for two days at one time, and finally the proprietor of the hotel, late in the evening of the second day, asked me if I had found my secretary, and I told him no. He said, "He is down in the billiard hall right now." So I had a boy go down for him and bring him up, and he and I severed our relations right there. If he had been upon the roll I would have had to take the trouble to go wherever that roll is kept and have gotten the keeper of it to take his name off of it, or he would have been paid at the end of the month, whether he worked for me or not. I then had to employ another secretary temporarily. I could not go home to get one, because we were right in the heat of a session of Congress. I had to have somebody at once, so I employed a young gentleman in this city; but I did not have him more than a week before he was as crazy as a loon, and I had to get rid of him. There were three during that particular session of Congress that I had to dispose of because of dereliction of duty, because they would steep their brains in drink and render themselves unfit for service. Now, do you tell me that we should bring upon ourselves a condition that would cause us to have to hunt up the roll keeper and make an explanation to him every time we had an unpleasantness of that kind in order to get rid of our clerk, or else let the clerk go on receiving the pay without doing any work? It is absolutely ridiculous, and I say to Members now that they must bring in a law and pass it regularly before they get them on the roll while I am a Member of Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think it would have been much easier to have found the Clerk of the House, in whose office this payment is made, than it would have been to find the secretary he was hunting for?

Mr. MACON. I had to get rid of him first.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I would not be in favor of any law that would take away from the Member the right, with cause or without cause or at his pleasure, to change his private secretary.

Mr. MACON. Suppose we were a thousand miles away from here at our homes, and the same situation should arise. Then I would have to write to the Clerk and explain the trouble.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Telegraph to him.

Mr. MACON. That would cost 75 cents or \$1. Why take upon ourselves that burden?

[The time of Mr. MACON having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.]

Mr. MACON. While we are on this subject, I will say that something has been said about the salaries that our clerks receive. I do not know how it is with the clerks of other Members, but I have heard no complaint from the splendid, faithful, and efficient young man whom I have had with me for the past two years about his compensation. He is entirely satisfied with it. He recognizes the fact that there are but 12 months in a year, and that under no circumstances can you crowd 13 months into 12, and he is honorable enough to be willing to receive for his services what he obligates himself to receive, and what Congress has said shall be paid him; and I want to serve notice right here and now that during the next administration of the affairs of this House everyone who seeks a position in it must understand that there will be only 12 months instead of 13 in each year.

If they are not willing to perform the duties of their office for 12 months with compensation for 12 months, then let them get out of the way and let some one else take their places. I believe the Democratic Party means what it says when it declares for economy. I know that I, an humble member of that political faith, mean what I say when I say that I am in favor of retrenchment in the governmental affairs of this Nation, and so far as I am concerned I am going to do my best to bring that happy condition about. Therefore I would oppose the proposition to put the clerks of Congressmen on the roll for one reason, if no other, and that is that it would give them an extra month's pay and increase the expenses of the Government \$50,000. I am opposed to 13-month years.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman is aware that the provision of clerks for Senators is \$2,000, and the gentleman is going to vote for it. I have made no motion to increase the salary of anybody. Does not the gentleman think that when he votes now for a bill to pay the clerks of Senators \$2,000 that that is extravagant?

Mr. MACON. In reply to the gentleman from Georgia I will gladly vote to cut the salary of clerks to Senators down to \$1,800. But in my judgment, if a Senator does his duty by one-half of the constituents of his State, as he ought to do, and if the Senator's secretary does his duty by one-half of the Senator's constituents as he ought to do, then they, Senators and clerks, are entitled to greater compensation than Members of the



lower House of Congress and their clerks. A Senator who discharges his duty as faithfully as a Representative does, in my judgment, ought to have received greater compensation from the formation of our Government than a Representative does, for his work is greater. I insist that a Senator who represents the constituency of a State has a greater responsibility and a greater work upon him than a Representative who only represents one-seventh or one-eleventh of the constituency of his State.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Is the gentleman a candidate for Senator from his State? [Laughter.]

Mr. MACON. I am not announcing myself as a candidate for the Senate now. When we get to that bridge we will talk about crossing it. I am talking now about what I think is proper for this House at this time to do in regard to the relationship that exists between a Representative and his clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired, and the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the words "two thousand" and inserting the words "one thousand five hundred."

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, lines 19 and 20, strike out the words "two thousand" and insert the words "one thousand five hundred," so that it will read "one thousand five hundred dollars."

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to say about it, except that I do not agree with the statement that the gentleman from Arkansas made that the burdens and duties of a Senator are so much more onerous, so much greater, than those imposed by law and duty upon a Member of the House. I do think that the discrepancy in the pay which the Senators' clerks and the clerks to Members of this House get is too great.

I do not believe that they are entitled to any more. I notice my friend from Arkansas has neither admitted nor denied the question I put to him whether he was a candidate for the United States Senate. I take it for granted that he is a receptive candidate, and I wish him much success in that new rôle. I do think, however, that he ought to wait until he dons the senatorial toga before he expresses the opinion that the duties of a Senator are so much more onerous and responsible than the duties of a Representative of this House. I offer the amendment, and I hope the gentleman from Arkansas will vote for it.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that his amendment if adopted would be futile. It has been for a long time the custom that one branch of the Legislature should be allowed to fix its own expenses, and if we should adopt an amendment like this, we know perfectly well that the Senate would put it back, and that furthermore we would have to yield.

It seems to me it is worse than useless, because it simply excites a little feeling over there as if we were interfering with their business when they abstain from interfering with ours. Knowing that it would be useless, without expressing any opinion as to the merits of the case, I hope that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Let me ask the gentleman, Is it not a fact that each Senator has other assistants in addition to his secretary?

Mr. GILLETT. I think so; I think each Senator has a messenger.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The word "messenger" is used, but he usually assists the Senator about his business.

Mr. GILLETT. They use them as they please.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. In other words, they are not confined to having simply to do messenger work.

Mr. GILLETT. No; but the gentleman well knows it has long been the custom to allow each House to fix its own assistants and the salaries of those assistants, and that must necessarily be so, if the two Houses are to act harmoniously.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not also true that they have 22 stenographers, as reported by this bill, to Senators who are not chairmen of committees?

Mr. GILLETT. I think so.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does not that include almost all of the Members of the Senate?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I think the majority of the Members of the Senate are the chairmen of committees.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Can the gentleman inform us how many committees there are and how many chairmen?

Mr. MADDEN. There are 35 Senators who are not chairmen.

Mr. GILLETT. Therefore two-thirds are chairmen.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. So they have a stenographer for each committee, and then 22 stenographers to Senators who are not chairmen of committees.

Mr. GILLETT. Exactly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then they have a messenger.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; I think so. They have a clerk, a stenographer, and a messenger.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the gentleman as to the rule that has heretofore been observed in that class of matters, particularly pertaining to each House, and I desire that it be still observed, but I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps the House has some sort of a precedent for interfering, inasmuch as the Senate is now proposing to regulate the rules of this body.

Mr. GILLETT. They are just adopting a joint rule.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, this would have to be acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; and we know how it would be acted upon by the Senate. Of course, we know we would have to yield; it would be simply walking up the hill and then walking down again, and it would create ill feeling between the two branches, without accomplishing any good; and I hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the proposition to reduce the salaries of the Senators' clerks because they fix the salaries. But I oppose it on merit. There is not a Senator of the United States who half fulfills the duties of his office who does not require all of the employees who are given to him, including the clerk, the stenographer, and the messenger. Let us take in this House, for instance, my friend from Arkansas [Mr. MACON], who is opposed to the proposition to in any way increase the pay of his clerk. I have profound sympathy for the clerk of the gentleman from Arkansas. I know that he earns a great deal more than the salary he gets.

I have watched the gentleman from Arkansas on the floor of this House, and, with the limited clerk hire which he is given, he has often saved to the Government large sums of money; and when he considers that we appropriate annually in the neighborhood of a billion dollars, that at the last session of Congress we enacted more than 300 public laws and a great number of private laws, that Members of Congress are supposed to keep track of the business of the House, and, in addition, to answer their correspondence, their constituents at home, and people throughout the country, it is idle to say that the pay now given to a clerk is too much, either in the Senate or the House. It would be well for the country if the Members of Congress could employ secretaries at a salary of four or five thousand dollars. It would be a great saving to the country, both in the way of money and in the way of legislation, if the clerks of Members could be employed of such capacity that they were able somewhat to judge of the merits of legislation and of appropriations, and aid the Member of Congress in the study which he must give to the subject. If the Member from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] should have three clerks instead of one, he could keep them all busy in the interest of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FOSTER of Vermont having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses, \$300, one half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill under what roll these people who sit at the doors around the galleries are employed.

Mr. GILLETT. Under the Doorkeeper of the House.

Mr. MORSE. What are they called?

Mr. GILLETT. They are messengers.

Mr. MORSE. What is the necessity for having so many of them?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman must ask the Committee on Accounts, which provided for them.

Mr. MORSE. Are they appropriated for in this bill?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly they are appropriated for, as they have been provided for by legislation of the House.

Mr. MORSE. And the same number is appropriated for in the bill as we have had heretofore?

Mr. GILLET. The same number.

Mr. MORSE. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that there are two sitting at each door at least—

Mr. MANN. Three at some of them. Some are on the soldiers' roll.

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman from Illinois suggests three. It seems to me, if we are going to economize, this is a pretty good place to economize. They are sitting around these doors so thick that you have to fall over them or over the cuspidors in order to get in. I would like to ask one further question. Do these elevators run the year round?

Mr. GILLET. I think so.

Mr. MORSE. Do all of them run the year round?

Mr. GILLET. Not in the summer; some get a vacation.

Mr. MORSE. You are appropriating for elevator men at the rate of \$100 a month, more than I ever heard of being paid to elevator men. When these men are not employed, are they still on the roll?

Mr. GILLET. Yes. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion in this Capitol we are employing more men at higher salaries for the same work than anywhere else in the United States. I suppose that is currently known and admitted, and that there is no question about it. If we want real reform in expenses, there is no place better than right here at the Capitol.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We will do it next year.

Mr. GILLET. We will see.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the gentleman from New York is right, but I fear not. I believe the time to begin is right now, when we are passing this bill.

Mr. DAWSON. If the gentleman will permit me, perhaps I can give him some information in regard to the elevator conductors. As the gentleman perhaps knows, the elevator conductors are under the Superintendent of the Capitol, but he, under the law, is under the direction of the Department of the Interior, so that the elevator conductors in the House only enjoy such privileges as civil-service men enjoy under the department. In other words, they get 30 days' leave of absence in the year.

Mr. MORSE. One more question.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit me, part of these employees of which the gentleman speaks are on what is called the old soldiers' roll. I think some 14 are on the soldiers' roll at \$1,200 each, amounting to \$16,800. They are in many instances the men who sit around the doors, and they are appointed, as I understand it, under the law as permanent employees; in other words, they are not subject to be dismissed by the Doorkeeper, who has charge of such other appointments. Fourteen men are on the old soldiers' roll and occupy the place of messengers to this House, as I understand it.

Mr. MORSE. Are they Civil War veterans?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes; altogether.

Mr. MORSE. And this is another method of pensioning them, is it?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I do not know how that is—

Mr. BURLESON. They draw a pension in addition.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. All I know is they are upon what is known as the old soldiers' roll.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Drawing a pension and a salary.

Mr. DAWSON. They are performing actual service.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I think the men on the soldiers' roll take care of one door, and that with many of them who are not on the soldiers' roll there are four or five taking care of a door.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. That may be; but my friend from Illinois can not put me in the position of attacking these positions, because I know a number of these old gentlemen. I am perfectly content; I think they are performing their duties very well, and I merely wanted to tell the gentleman they are old employees of this House on the soldiers' roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. They are there permanently, and it was a gratuity that that provision was made and they were put upon the soldiers' roll. I know that quite a number of them have died since I have been here, because their funeral expenses have been provided for by the House.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to taking care of these old soldiers in this way. I believe in war pensions, not civil pensions, and I believe in pensioning them most liberally. But I think it should be called "pensions;" I do not think it should be called "employment" unless they are employed, and I doubt very much if this whole army around this gallery is composed of Civil War veterans. If so, there are more veterans of the Civil War than I had any reason to believe there were.

Mr. GILLET. I think the gentleman from Georgia stated it incorrectly when he said that all the messengers are on the soldiers' roll. All these messengers are not on the soldiers' roll. As I remember, there are to-day 15 on that roll.

I may also say to the gentleman that I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DAWSON] was mistaken when he said, in speaking about the elevator conductors, that they were under the Department of the Interior. As I understand it, the Superintendent of the Capitol has three rolls—one is a Senate roll, one is a House roll, and the other his office roll. Those on the Senate and House rolls are political appointees, and are not under the Interior Department. They are simply patronage appointments of the House and Senate.

Mr. MORSE. They could not stay here unless we appropriated for them, anyway, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLET. No.

Mr. MORSE. One further question. Do these barbers that are employed here remain here the year round? When the House is not in session do they keep those barbers employed down there at \$50 a month?

Mr. GILLET. I think they have to do cleaning in the summer. They are annual.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Their salaries are annual. There is no question about that.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LONGWORTH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. JOEL COOK, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President, to join a committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives, to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. COOK, at Philadelphia, Pa.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

And that in compliance with the foregoing the Vice President had appointed as said committee Mr. PENROSE, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HEYBURN, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. JOHNSTON.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to continue in full force and effect an act entitled "An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate Army and Navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 27400. An act to repeal an act authorizing the issuance of a patent to James F. Rowell.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Clerk: Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; hire of horse and wagon for use of the Clerk's office, \$900, or so much thereof as may be necessary; chief clerk, \$4,500; journal clerk, and two reading clerks, at \$4,000 each; stenographer to journal clerk, \$980; disbursing clerk, \$3,400; tally clerk, \$3,300; file clerk, \$3,250; enrolling clerk, \$3,000; printing and bill clerk, \$2,700; assistant to chief clerk, index clerk, and assistant enrolling clerk, at \$2,500 each; assistant disbursing clerk, \$2,400; notification clerk, \$2,300; distributing clerk, \$2,250; assistant journal clerk, and stationery clerk, at \$2,200 each; librarian, and document and bill clerk, at \$2,100 each; resolution and petition clerk, printing and document clerk, and assistant stationery clerk, at \$2,000 each; assistant file clerk, and document clerk, at \$1,900 each; assistant enrolling clerk, superintendent clerk's document room, assistant to printing and bill clerk, 2 assistant librarians, and 1 clerk, at \$1,800 each; assistant index clerk, \$1,700; four clerks, at \$1,680 each; bookkeeper, assistant in Clerk's office, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,600 each; special employee in clerk's document room, \$1,580; telegraph operator, \$1,400; assistant telegraph operator, authorized and named in resolution adopted January 15, 1902, \$1,400; stenographer to clerk, \$1,400; locksmith, who shall be skilled in his trade, \$1,300; messenger in chief clerk's office, and assistant in stationery room, at \$1,200 each; messenger in file room, 2 messengers in disbursing office, and assistant in House library, at \$1,100 each;



assistant in document room, \$980; 3 telephone operators, at \$900 each; 3 telephone operators at \$75 per month each from December 1, 1911, to June 30, 1912; night telephone operator, \$720; for services of a substitute telephone operator when required, at \$2.50 per day, \$450; page, \$900; assistant in charge of bathroom, \$1,400; 3 laborers in the bathroom, at \$900 each; 2 janitors, including one for index room and police detention room, at \$840 each; janitor in House library, and janitor in file room, at \$800 each; janitor in journal clerk's room, \$720; 2 laborers, and page in enrolling room, at \$720 each; allowance to chief clerk for stenographic and typewriter services, \$1,000; 3 clerks to continue preparation of Digest of Private Claims, at \$1,600 each; in all, \$134,665.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, especially to that part of the paragraph, on page 16, as follows:

Hire of horse and wagon for use of the Clerk's office, \$900, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

What is the necessity for that?

Mr. GILLETT. That is the delivery wagon of the House, and simply delivers the stationery desired to Members.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That language, I see, is the same language that was in the last bill.

Mr. GILLETT. The same language; yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now, I would like to know whether or not there was that amount of money so expended last year. How much was expended last year?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not remember. I do not think we inquired. It is the same amount every year, and we passed it along without investigating.

Mr. COX of Indiana. You do not know whether the full amount was expended or not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The full amount of what?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The full amount stated in the bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly it was. It belongs to the clerk that carries the stationery to your house and mine.

Mr. COX of Indiana. This is for the use of the wagon for the Clerk's office. Does the gentleman say that the \$900 last year was all expended?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Was that the evidence before the committee?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is right. It is for the support of the horse and wagon for the stationery department.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The point in my mind is whether or not it was a private proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is an express wagon.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out all after the word "three," on line 17, page 18, and ending with the word "each," on line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 17, beginning with the word "three," strike out "three clerks to continue preparation of Digest of Private Claims, at \$1,600 each."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to give a little history. In the Fifty-eighth Congress, six years ago, there was a provision in the legislative bill to pay clerks for compiling a digest of claims that had been made through bills in Congress. I made some investigation at that time; and that little committee has been running on for several years. Several years ago somebody got a resolution through to appoint a committee to make a digest of the claims that were pending before Congress. No doubt Congress thought when they provided for this committee that a little book, showing in concise form the various claims that were pending before the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, would be gotten out. But up to that time—the Fifty-eighth Congress—I found that the three clerks had been working on this so-called digest for years, and they had included in this so-called compilation of claims every pension bill that had ever been introduced in Congress. They had a volume of matter that if it were all printed would fill a mail sack full of books, something that we would not have printed if they were to complete the work, something that nobody would have if it were printed.

In view of the situation as it then developed, I offered an amendment to this legislative bill, and that amendment prevailed. My amendment provided that this appropriation should complete this digest, and that was the language carried in the bill, "To complete the digest." But the work is still going on—three men at \$1,600 a year each. This bill does not go into effect until July 1, 1911, and it contemplates carrying this expenditure on until July 1, 1912. Now, gentlemen, I called attention to this thing in the Fifty-eighth Congress. The facts were stated then.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How long had the item been running then? Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. It had been running several years. It had cost thousands of dollars.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then it is very much like a commission that never ends.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. A never-ending commission.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Has it been printed?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Oh, no; they would have to get an order for printing from the Committee on Printing, which they would never do, because it would cost many thousands of dollars to print it.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The Committee on Printing would refuse to give them such an order?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The Committee on Printing would refuse to give an order.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will permit me, I desire to state to him that the Committee on Appropriations is not responsible for this appropriation in this bill, nor are we responsible for the character of it. It came to us from another committee, and it is in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. And I want it out.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman inform us what it would be worth if printed?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. It would not be worth anything.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does the gentleman from South Carolina expect these men to work themselves out of a job?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I would like to have a little more time. I do not occupy the floor very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I was saying I called the attention of the House to these facts away back in the Fifty-eighth Congress. The facts were such then that the House felt justified in amending the bill so as to provide that that appropriation should complete the work, and still it is going on. Now, the gentleman from Georgia says that the Committee on Appropriations is not responsible. I am not saying anything about who is responsible. It is in the bill, and I want it out. We will see what the House wants.

Mr. MADDEN. Move it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I have moved to strike it out.

Now, I believe myself that a small volume which any good lawyer could take the claims pending in this House and compile in 6 or 12 months, setting forth the name of the claimant, the amount of the claim, and in a few words explaining the nature or basis of these claims, would be a valuable public document. I believe that when Congress authorized this thing to be compiled that is what they thought they would get. Now, they have been working for years, and the matter they have would make a mail bag full of books. The Committee on Printing of this House would never bring in a resolution authorizing it to be printed if this committee ever completes the work.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Who appoints these three clerks?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I do not know; I do not know whose pets they are, or what they are worth, or anything about that. It is a useless piece of work, and has been extended entirely too long.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, these clerks were put upon this bill originally, not by a report from the Committee on Appropriations, but on a report from the Committee on Accounts, which was passed on the floor of this House. The Committee on Appropriations have reported it every year since, supposing that the House had expressed its opinion in favor of the provision; but of course the House can at any time strike out the provision for these clerks.

Now, I consider it my duty in general, having charge of the bill, to defend it, to make points of order upon amendments which are subject to them, and in general to support the bill; but I do not consider it my duty to oppose by argument, although I may in vote, an amendment which I think is proper, and therefore I have nothing more to say upon this amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the total of the paragraph to conform to the amendment just agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, on page 18, line 9, I move to strike out the words "one thousand four hundred" and insert in place thereof the words "six hundred."

Mr. Chairman, we are providing here for one assistant in the bathroom at \$1,400 a year and three laborers in the bathroom at \$900 a year, to assist this assistant, I take it, a total expenditure for that bathroom of \$4,100 for the three months of this year that Congress will be in session. It seems to me that if we are going to begin to economize, here is another good place to do so, and for the three months that this House is in session and that bathroom is in use you can get a man to take care of it for \$600, I am very certain, which is \$200 a month.

Mr. MANN. Why not cut it off entirely? What is the use of having baths?

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman from Chicago can get along without baths—

Mr. MANN. Evidently the gentleman from Wisconsin does.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman from Chicago can get along without baths, it is perfectly proper to cut them out. The gentleman from Wisconsin can not, and therefore is not in favor of cutting them out entirely.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that these attendants are paid ordinarily by the Members who get their baths there, in the way of tips, just as much as they would be paid in a private bathroom, and I am very much in favor of cutting down this useless expenditure.

Mr. MADDEN. I move, as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman, that all the language relating to the bathroom be stricken out and that the bathroom be closed, because most of the Members have their own bathrooms, and ought to have them, if they have not, and there is not any sense in having public bathrooms for private individuals, paid for at the Government expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I should like to inquire something about this bathroom. How many tubs has it?

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will suspend until the amendment is reported.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out, beginning with the word "assistant," in line 8, down to and including the word "each," in line 10, on page 18.

Mr. PARKER. I raise the point of order. The second amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. If gentlemen will suspend, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, strike out, beginning with the word "assistant," in line 8, down to and including the word "each," in line 10.

Mr. PARKER. I raise the point of order that it is not in order to move to strike out the paragraph until the clause itself is perfected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before voting on this I should like to ask to be more fully advised.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that the current appropriation carries this.

Mr. MANN. The question is, Is the next House going to take baths? [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. The great unwashed come in for the next Congress and will have no use for bathrooms, so I think the amendment entirely appropriate; but there is valuable property there that ought to be taken care of, until there is use for the bathroom again.

Mr. COX of Indiana. It may be that on account of the fate of that side of the House in the recent election it is in favor of dispensing with the bathtubs. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. That may account for the fact that there will be no necessity of having bathrooms after the 4th of March. I think it is entirely proper that the amount paid to these men should be very materially cut down.

Mr. MANN. There are four men provided for the bathroom over there; there are a large number of bathtubs and they are almost constantly in use. Those Members of the House who do not take baths ought not to be too critical of those who do take them. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Some Members of the House take baths where they live at seasonable hours of the day.

Mr. MANN. And at seasonable seasons of the year. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; some, of course, at proper seasons of the year.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Gentlemen have not forgotten that a great number of the Members on this side of the House

took a bath when they went up Salt River on the 8th of November.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; that helped some. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GILLETT) there were 30 ayes and 29 noes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GILLETT and Mr. MADDEN.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were 44 ayes and 43 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 20, page 18, the following:

"The Superintendent of the Capitol is directed to dispose of the bathtubs and furnishings of the bathrooms in the House Office Building and cover the proceeds of the same into the Treasury."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word before we leave that paragraph. This paragraph we are now considering in such a dignified and solemn way provides for the employment of a great many people around the House of Representatives from July 1, 1911, until July 1, 1912. What I am particularly anxious to know from the gentleman who has charge of this bill is who is going to fill all these offices after next July.

Mr. MADDEN. The same people that fill them now.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The same people that are now occupying the positions.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. This bill does not go into effect until July next.

Mr. GILLETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not catch his question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I say this bill does not go into effect until next July, and there are a great retinue of employees around the offices. Now, until the assembling of Congress in December, who fills these places, and upon whose authority do all these janitors and doorkeepers and clerks of committees that have not been appointed fill these positions?

Mr. GILLETT. Some are under the Doorkeeper and some under the Clerk and some under the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Yes; but here is a clerk of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and various other committees that have not been organized.

Mr. GILLETT. I understand; but the old organization holds until it is filled with a new one.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Always; and the current appropriation bill carries their pay.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is that true of the Sergeant at Arms after the session closes?

Mr. GILLETT. I suppose so.

Mr. SHERLEY. Under what law?

Mr. CANNON. Under the law of necessity, so that Members may get their monthly pay.

Mr. MANN. The Sergeant at Arms must exercise the duties of his office until a new Sergeant at Arms is elected. That is the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The committee clerks appointed for this Congress will continue to act as clerks to committees which have not been organized?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly. They always do.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Well, that is a lame place in the law.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that only those clerks to committees who are known as annual clerks, and who get an annual salary, will be retained?

Mr. GILLETT. That is what he asks.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. There are quite a number of committees that have session clerks, whose duties and whose salaries expire with the session of Congress on March 4, and who will not be clerks and who will not get any salary after that time. Take committees such as the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Appropriations and a number of others that it is not necessary to name, they have annual clerks authorized by law, and the salaries of those clerks are annual,



and they will receive the salary until they are either removed or succeeded by somebody else. Does that give the gentleman the information?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That is very clear and ought to be very satisfactory to some of the membership of this House, because it certainly gives them a good deal of grace.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote that was just taken by which we moved to sell the bathtubs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote which has just been taken in regard to the bathtubs. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know why the gentleman wishes to reconsider. What is the object of having the bathtubs when they will only collect dirt, and may be filled with coal, as they are in some houses?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have never been in these rooms myself, but I suppose we have over there an elaborate system of bathtubs and plumbing, which has been very expensive. It has been put in simply for that purpose, and the rooms would not be available for any other purpose, and to sell the bathtubs and get a few hundred dollars would be simply spoiling what cost a great many thousand dollars and what would be valuable for the future. It seems to me that, on reflection, the House would not approve such conduct, that it would be an extravagance, and I think we ought not to sell those bathtubs. The building is arranged for them, and I think they ought to be left there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman not think that they should be left there as monuments to a policy?

Mr. GILLETT. I have nothing to say about the original wisdom of putting them in. It may have been wise or it may have been foolish, but after spending a large sum of money to put them in, I think it is unwise now to get a very small return and spoil those elaborate rooms. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], on reflection, will think so himself.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think it is a mistake not to operate the bathtubs.

Mr. GILLETT. They will be operated if we have them.

Mr. MANN. But I think, also, it is a mistake to expect people to operate them for nothing, and I am not in favor of the House making a monkey of itself. To say that we will maintain bathtubs with no one to be in charge of them is ridiculous. I do not want to see the House take a ridiculous attitude, and while I could not vote for the proposition to do away with the attendants, still, the attendants having been done away with, I can see no reason for maintaining the bathtubs over there.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to the gentleman that we might rent them out and let other parties run them. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Now, there is always a great deal of necessity for room over there in those bathtubs. If we increase the representation in the House in the next Congress, we will need these bathtubs to lodge some of my Democratic friends in.

Mr. GILLETT. They are in the basement, are they not?

Mr. MANN. They are below the basement.

Mr. GILLETT. Of course, if we keep them there, there will ultimately have to be at least one attendant, and he will undoubtedly be provided.

Mr. MANN. How can he be provided?

Mr. GILLETT. He can not be provided for immediately.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; of course I have no doubt the bathtubs and bathtubs will remain there in any event until the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, and that immediately following that, on the appointment of the Committee on Accounts, there will be a resolution presented and adopted providing, not only that the bathtubs shall remain, but instead of four, that they shall have six; and wishing to watch that procedure at the present I shall object to the request for unanimous consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks, messengers, and janitors to committees: Clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,000; assistant clerk, \$1,900; 2 janitors, 1 at \$1,000 and 1 at \$720; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$4,000, and \$1,000 additional while the office is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,500; assistant clerk, \$1,900; janitor, \$1,000; clerks to Committees on Accounts, Agriculture, Claims, District of Columbia, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Indian Affairs, Invalid Pensions, Judiciary, Military Affairs, Pensions, Post Offices and Post Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, Rivers and Harbors, War Claims, and clerk to continue Digest of Claims under resolution of March 7, 1888, 16 in all, at \$2,500 each; clerk to Committee on Naval Affairs, \$2,400; stenographer to Committee on Invalid Pensions, \$2,190; clerks to the Committees on Banking and Currency, Census, Coinage, Weights, and Measures, Elections Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Enrolled Bills, Immigration and Naturalization, Industrial Arts and Expositions, Insular Affairs, Irrigation of Arid Lands, Labor, Library, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Patents, Printing, Public Lands, Revision of the

Laws, Rules, Territories, additional clerk to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and assistant clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, 22 in all, at \$2,000 each; assistant clerks to the Committees on Accounts, Agriculture, District of Columbia, Foreign Affairs, Indian Affairs, and Rivers and Harbors, 6 in all, at \$1,800 each; assistant clerks to the Committees on the Judiciary and Pensions, 2 in all, at \$1,600 each; assistant clerks to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Military Affairs, and Naval Affairs, 3 in all, at \$1,500 each; assistant clerk to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, \$1,400; assistant clerks to the Committees on Banking and Currency, Claims, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, and War Claims, 5 in all, at \$1,200 each; in all \$133,010.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. If this is the end of the paragraph and an amendment is in order, I desire to offer one. Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a few points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the language found on page 19, beginning on line 15 and ending on line 16, \$500, which appears to be an increase of salary to that extent. Again, on page 20, line 9, I notice there is a clerk provided for the Rules Committee. That seems to be new, and I reserve the point of order against that position.

Mr. GILLETT. What line is that?

Mr. MACON. Page 20, line 9, which provides for a clerk for the Rules Committee, which seems to be new.

Mr. MANN. The Rules Committee already has that now.

Mr. MACON. I do not think it needs any clerk just now.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We have not read that yet.

Mr. MACON. I beg the gentleman's pardon, the gentleman is way behind the times. [Laughter.] Now, in line 14, the same page, Foreign Affairs. It seems we are providing a clerk for that committee that has not heretofore been carried in the bill, so I make the point of order against those two new positions and the increase of salary, as mentioned on page 19.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, first as to the assistant clerk to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That was passed last year in the deficiency bill, and this committee has done in this case exactly what is done in all cases, that where the House has expressed its opinion that a clerk's salary should be raised one year we have continued it in the future. So in regard to the clerk to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the House has expressed its opinion and we have followed it.

As to the assistant clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman is aware that we have a clerk to the Committee on Appropriations whose presence prevents me from saying all I should like to say about him. He has been most valuable for a great many years. We have now an assistant clerk who has been there for a great many years, who is showing great capacity, and who we hope will grow up so that he can ultimately be the successor in, I hope, the far distant time to the present clerk.

Mr. MACON. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him—

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. MACON. In the nature of things that particular clerk will disappear before this appropriation begins.

Mr. GILLETT. Why, no; up to the present time in the Committee on Appropriations a change of party has made no difference in the change of clerks, the new party keeps the same clerks, and I suspect the same will follow next year.

Mr. MANN. The interesting thing, I may say to the gentleman, is that the clerk to the Committee on Appropriations in the House and the clerk to the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate, I believe, were both appointed by Democrats.

Mr. SHERLEY. Which accounts for their efficiency somewhat.

Mr. MACON. In my judgment, we have had mighty few Members of this House on the Appropriations Committee or any other committee who have rendered such efficient service to this country as the gentleman who occupies that position now, and we could not well get along without him.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman could not raise any controversy about that in the House or out of it.

Mr. GILLETT. And we wish to follow that. I think the gentleman will recognize the wisdom of it. We wish to follow that and make this assistant clerk a permanent official. He is showing great capacity, and we thought it was fair that his salary should be increased \$500. And, then, as to the Rules Committee, the gentleman is aware that that was a new committee which was established last session, and I am very sure a resolution was adopted giving them a clerk. So, of course, this is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MACON. Why did it not appear in your last appropriation bill?

Mr. GILLETT. It was in a deficiency bill last year.

Mr. DALZELL. The committee was reorganized and elected by the House.

Mr. MACON. Was there a resolution adopted authorizing a clerk for the committee?

Mr. GILLET. There was; and I trust that as to the clerk of the Appropriations Committee the gentleman will not insist on the point of order. I think he will recognize in that committee, which does not change its clerk at the time of a change of administration, where it is not a partisan office, it is very desirable they should train up and well remunerate this competent clerk.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon the point of order against the increase of salary, but the other two points, of course, will have to be withdrawn because of the fact that they are authorized by a resolution of the House, which is existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] withdraws his point of order as to the items on page 20, and insists on his point of order as to the item of \$500, on page 19.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. MACON. With pleasure.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order on this increase to the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not like to detain the House, but I want to get the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would like to say a few words, if I may be permitted to do so, at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MANN. I will be through in a moment. The Committee on Appropriations, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] well knows, in the preparation of the appropriation bills, and in the information which is furnished in connection with the appropriation bills, does work which is invaluable to those Members of the House, who distinctly include the gentleman from Arkansas, who follow the appropriation bills. It is impossible for Mr. Courts to do all of the work in the Appropriation Committee that devolves upon a clerk. The appropriations have increased so much in recent years, and the items in reference to appropriations have so largely increased in number, that it is not practicable for one person to do that. Some of these committee clerks are busily engaged all the summer, but this committee clerk is practically working all the time. The clerks to the Committee on Appropriations never cease work. I do not know whether the next chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will keep this assistant clerk or not, but of course it is wholly within his power to obtain a new clerk in the place of the one that is there now, but I apprehend that whoever goes in as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is likely to follow the precedent which has been set by many chairmen in recent years of not changing the clerical force in that committee except as to the one which does his private work, if there be such a person. The gentleman from Arkansas and I agree upon most of these items, and I hope that in the interests of economy he will permit this increase to be made to this clerk.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] is on his feet and waiting for recognition.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add a word at this point, if the gentleman still insists on his point of order.

It has been my privilege to be on the Committee on Appropriations now for 10 regular sessions of the Congress. For a long time I did not know what the politics of the present clerk of that committee was. I have learned incidentally that he came here many years ago, appointed by a leading Democrat from Tennessee. He has been here continuously since, though different parties have controlled the House.

Later there came a vacancy in the assistant clerkship. It so happened that a conspicuous Democrat from Indiana was then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and he appointed a young man from his own State. I do not know what his politics is, but it does not make any difference.

In the committee we never inquired as to that. He was very competent, having been trained in that committee, and when the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate failed in health they asked for his transfer there. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate died during the recent vacation, I believe. Now, what did the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate, a Republican of Republicans, do? Looking only for one who could perform

the most efficient service, not for the Republican Party, but for the Senate, he took this young Democrat, if he was such, as I assume he was, being appointed by a Democratic chairman of the Committee of Appropriations of the House, and made him clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. At a higher salary than we were paying.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. At a higher salary.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And we will lose this one in the same way, if we can not give him this increase in salary.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I have never known the politics of the present assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. I assumed that he is a Republican, as he was appointed by a Republican chairman of that committee, but it is not economy, I will say, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas—

Mr. MACON. I am listening to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is not economy to whittle on the salaries of such men, on whose knowledge so much depends. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order and allow the sum named in the bill to stand.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word or two. I happened for some time to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I watched with a great deal of interest the valuable work done by the clerks of that committee. The knowledge which they have of the laws of the country and its financial needs would justify the payment of very much more compensation than they receive. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations has a knowledge of the Nation's needs superior to that of any other man in the Government service. That young man who is acting as his assistant is a lawyer. He is a bright, clean-cut, forceful, courteous, able man. He has been in the work long enough to be familiar with it. It is not merely clerical work that these men have to do. They have to be familiar with the laws. They have to be able to tell the Committee on Appropriations what law the appropriations are based upon; and there is not a law upon which any appropriation is based that can not be turned to in an instant by these men who are acting as clerks of this committee. The fact is that the reputation of the Committee on Appropriations is largely due to the efficiency of the clerks. I do not think I overstate it when I say that. I would regret very much to see anything done in this committee that would in any way embarrass a work which is so important as that of this great Committee on Appropriations. It takes a long period of training to make a man efficient for that work; and the young man who is assisting the clerk of the committee has given his time, night and day, to that work. He has made a thorough study of it.

Mr. MACON. How long has he been with the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. He has been with the committee four years, if I am not mistaken. He has been there long enough to have served his apprenticeship, long enough to have become grounded in the work, long enough to do good work, long enough to be able to fill the place of the man who is the clerk of the committee in case of absolute need. He is the most efficient man I have seen appointed to any place in connection with the service of the House. The importance of the place he occupies is so great that it would be unfortunate to the service of the committee should he be called upon to leave the service by reason of the fact that he could get more compensation in some other place. There is no doubt whatever but that he would be infinitely better off if he were to take some place in the commercial life of the country than to retain the place he now holds. But, in the interest of the Government, I think it is clearly our duty to keep him, if we can.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues on this side to the peculiar conditions affecting the Committee on Appropriations, one that is of very great importance at the opening of the coming session of Congress. The Committee on Appropriations has five annual appropriation bills, in addition to the deficiency bill, and there are usually two or three of those in a year. Notwithstanding that fact, its clerical force is no greater than the clerical force of the Committee on Naval Affairs or the Committee on Military Affairs. The clerks are paid a little higher. Gentlemen familiar with the work required in the naval appropriation bill must realize the enormous increase of work that falls on those clerks in the preparation of seven or eight important appropriation bills.

To the next Congress there have been elected but three Democrats who are now serving on the Committee on Appropriations. It will be necessary to put upon that committee nine Members of the House who have had no service upon that committee. It will be one of the difficult tasks of the House so to adjust matters that Members without that experience will be able to familiarize themselves with the work of the committee suffi-



ciently early to render that effective service that the House and the country will demand. This gentleman who now fills the position of assistant clerk is a competent man. If through illness or any misfortune the clerk of the committee should be incapacitated, the committee would require the services of this assistant clerk, regardless of the compensation he might demand. I doubt if it would be possible to organize a committee from the membership of the House that could perform its work satisfactorily if these two men, the clerk and the assistant clerk, were incapacitated for service. For a number of years it has never been necessary, has never been part of the work of the chairman of the committee, or any member in charge of a bill, to prepare conference reports and statements, these gentlemen having performed that work.

The slightest error or slip of the pen might involve the House and Congress in difficulties that could not be adequately described, and perhaps would result in contentions and scandals that might involve the reputations of many Members. Yet these men have served so efficiently and faithfully, that during many long years there has never been the slightest error or mistake with which any Member might find fault. These places, in my judgment, come nearer to being of a class where men will be retained in them, regardless of their politics, than any other places in the Government service. I recall, when I was first assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, approaching the end of a session just immediately preceding an election, I remarked jocosely one day that if the election were to favor the Democrats in the coming fall there were two good places that the Democrats would have at their disposal, referring to the clerkship and the assistant clerkship of the Committee on Appropriations, the men occupying those positions being before me. Everybody in my hearing laughed heartily, and then informed me that both these gentlemen were Democrats, one having been in the service of the committee more than 20 years, and the other having been in the service of the committee over 12 years. It was one of those interesting things that show that in a body like this the efficient men, the men essential to the public service, are retained and appreciated regardless of their political opinions. Now, I believe, considering the nature of the work, considering the character of the positions these men hold, considering the fact that they are engaged in the work of the committee not only while it is in session but, with the exception of perhaps four to six weeks in the heated session, during the entire year, the compensation of \$2,500 is reasonable, and I hope under the circumstances my colleague will not insist on the point of order.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that the gentleman whose salary I attempted to prevent being increased was quite so important to the committee until now. If I had understood it, I would not have reserved the point of order against it. What I said about gentlemen passing out of office before the next Congress convened was intended to convey the idea that I did not want anybody to think that I would under any circumstances try to punish any official of this House simply because he might be of an opposing political faith to myself. I do not want anyone to think that I would use politics as a weapon to punish any worthy official with. But as to this gentleman, it seems from what the members of the committee say, that his services are almost invaluable, and I hope he will be retained in his present position by the committee, whether he is a Democrat or a Republican. I would not give the snap of my finger for that, so long as the duties of the official are faithfully and efficiently performed. Politics has nothing to do with clerical positions, in my judgment. Efficiency is the thing we want. After hearing the members of the committee say it is necessary for this gentleman to remain in his present position, and that he deserves an increase in his salary for his efficient services, I will withdraw the point of order gladly.

The CHAIRMAN. All points of order are withdrawn.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following formal amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 21, in line 2, after the word "thousand," insert the words "five hundred."

Mr. GILLETT. That corrects a mistake in the total.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information from the chairman of the committee. On page 19, line 22, it says, "and clerk to continue digest of claims under resolution of March 7, 1886." I want to know if that is the clerk who is detailed from the Court of Claims to the Committee on War Claims, or is it a clerk employed under the same resolution that I have been attacking this afternoon?

Mr. GILLETT. No; that is the one the gentleman first mentioned and he is a valuable official.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. He is a very valuable man and I do not care to interfere with him, but if it is a clerkship to this same committee that I have been complaining about this afternoon I should want to strike it out.

Mr. GILLETT. It does not refer to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Doorkeeper: Doorkeeper, \$5,000; hire of horses and wagons and repairs of same, \$1,200, or so much thereof as may be necessary; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,500; department messenger, \$2,250; special employee, John T. Chancey, \$1,800; special employee, \$1,500; superintendent of reporters' gallery, \$1,400; clerk to Doorkeeper, \$1,200; janitor, \$1,500; 25 messengers, at \$1,180 each; messenger to the Speaker's table, \$1,200; 14 messengers on the soldiers' roll, at \$1,200 each; 12 laborers, at \$720 each; 2 laborers in the water-closet, 1 at \$840 and 1 at \$720; skilled laborer, \$840; 9 laborers, at \$720 each; laborer, \$680; 2 laborers, known as cloakroom men, at \$840 each; 8 laborers, known as cloakroom men, 2 at \$720 each, and 6 at \$600 each; female attendant in ladies' retiring room, \$800; superintendent of folding room, \$2,500; chief clerk \$2,000; 4 clerks, at \$1,600 each; foreman, \$1,800; assistant foreman, \$1,200; second assistant foreman, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,200; page, \$720; laborer, \$720; 32 folders, at \$900 each; 2 night watchmen, at \$720 each; 2 drivers, at \$840 each; 2 chief pages, at \$1,200 each; messenger in charge of telephones, \$1,200; messenger in charge of telephones (for the minority), \$1,200; 46 pages, during the session, including two riding pages, 4 telephone pages, press-gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$2.50 per day each, \$23,150; horse and buggy for department messenger, \$250; superintendent of document room, \$2,900; assistant superintendent, \$2,100; clerk, \$1,700; assistant clerk, \$1,600; 7 assistants, at \$1,280 each; assistant, \$1,100; janitor, \$920; 2 attendants in the old library space, at \$1,500 each; messenger to press room, \$1,000; in all, \$192,710.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the committee what the 25 messengers mentioned at the end of line 9, page 23, do.

Mr. GILLETT. Those are the various messengers at the doors of the House.

Mr. MORSE. Including the galleries?

Mr. GILLETT. Some on the floor and some in the galleries.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the gentleman think that we could get along with half of that number very nicely without increasing the labor of any of them to any great extent?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, as I told the gentleman earlier in the day, I believe we employ a great many more men in the House than is necessary. I made up my mind some years ago that I should not, in my zeal for economy, try to interfere with the force of this House. When I once attempted it I found I was running up against personal friends and that I was incurring a general unpopularity by trying to curtail the force in the House, and I concluded that that was a matter I would let alone, for it became too personal. I say frankly that I do believe that we employ a great many more men at a higher salary than is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the statement of the chairman in charge of the bill I will withdraw my pro forma amendment and offer the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 9, strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert the word "fifteen."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, of course this amendment does not begin to cure the abuse. What ought to be done is to thoroughly investigate the organization of the House force, if we are going to do anything, and amend it all along the line. There is ample field for it, and this is simply a mere haphazard guess of what is needed.

Mr. MORSE. I quite agree with the gentleman that this does not cure the abuse, and I quite agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that this is an abuse, and I will say to him that it is in a sense a haphazard amendment. It has seemed to me for a long time that we have altogether too many employees, and the gentleman has admitted that here is one spot where we can economize by cutting out, he said, perhaps half. I have been very liberal. I have cut out only 10 of the 25, and I sincerely hope that this amendment will pass.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this House is prepared to-day to go with a blind bridle in this way. I have been here 20 years, and I can not tell how many doors we have and how many messengers we must have. It has been a long time since the House administrative forces have been reorganized. That would be the only intelligent way to go about it. We have janitors many. You might as well put in an amendment cutting off half of them. There is no man on the floor who could tell whether that amendment would be proper or improper. There is not a man here who can tell whether we should have 10 or 15 messengers, or how many doors there are to be cared for. I hope the House will not do business in that way. You can pass this over, if you wish, and appoint a committee to investigate the matter and report back

to the House in time for the deficiency bill, and it can be corrected then; but the whole organization should be overhauled. You can find men here everywhere that you and I do not see any use for, but still we have not investigated the matter and we do not know now. The only point I wish to submit is that you should act intelligently and not hastily in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 23, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk hire, necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$1,500 per annum, in monthly installments, \$598,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "\$1,500 per annum," and insert the words "\$2,000 per annum."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the point of order is sustained let us see whether it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the desire of the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. I desire to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the allowance for clerk hire is fixed by law at \$1,500.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the Chair will be willing to hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. There is no law that fixes the salary at \$1,500.

Mr. GILLETT. It is fixed at \$1,200.

Mr. MANN. The current appropriation law provides for a clerk hire of \$1,500, and that is only for the current fiscal year. There was a joint resolution passed by Congress some years ago providing for the payment of clerk hire during the session at the rate of \$1,200 per annum. That has been extended from time to time in the appropriation acts, by increasing the amount of the appropriation, and the question is whether the paragraph itself is not itself subject to a point of order. Of course, if the paragraph itself is subject to a point of order, then the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado is not subject to the point of order. I call the attention of the Chair to the joint resolution of March 3, 1893, which provided that—

On and after April 1, 1893, each Member and Delegate of the House of Representatives, etc., may, on the first day of every month during the sessions of Congress, certify to the Clerk of the House of Representatives the amount which he has paid or agreed to pay for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official duties during the previous month, and the amount so certified shall be paid by the Clerk out of the contingent fund of the House on the fourth day of each month to the person or persons named in each of said certificates: *Provided*, That the amount so certified and paid for clerical services rendered to each Member, etc., shall not exceed \$100 for any month during the session.

I may be mistaken, but I think I am not, in saying that that is the only legislation which Congress has enacted upon the subject, except in appropriation bills. I am not sure but that there was a resolution subsequent to that making the clerk hire annual instead of sessional.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Illinois how the amount was fixed at \$1,500? Was it by resolution reported from a committee and adopted by the House?

Mr. MANN. I understand not. I understand the amount of \$1,500 was fixed simply in the same method that the item is carried in this appropriation bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman to say that he is correct about the amount? There was a resolution, however, that made it annual in place of sessional.

Mr. MANN. I think that is correct. It was made annual, anyway. The original resolution was passed before the Fifty-second Congress. When I came into the Fifty-fifth Congress, and just before that, as I recollect, the clerk hire was made annual. It was annual when I came into the House.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the provision in the legislative appropriation bill of 1907, which reads:

Each Representative and Delegate for clerk hire, necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$1,500 per annum, in monthly installments. Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31, Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I will call the attention of the Chair also to the fact that he will find identically the same language in the next appropriation law and the current fiscal year, and he will find identically the same language in this bill. It never was considered that made permanent law which would not be carried in other appropriation laws. If it had been considered to be permanent law, that is not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course that is true, but does not this provision extend beyond the life of the appropriation?

Mr. MANN. But it is perfectly clear this does not extend beyond the life of the appropriation because it expressly provides this appropriation. That is the language of the law which the Chairman read. That is in the current fiscal law and that is in the bill. That is legislation, but it applies only to this appropriation. It seems to me it is inevitable on the question of the point of order it was subject to the point of order itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to look for a moment at the act of 1893.

Mr. MANN. Now, subject to the passage of the resolution which was for the clerk hire, a resolution was passed providing that clerk hire should be annual instead of session but leaving the amount the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman state to the Chair when that resolution was passed?

Mr. MANN. I think it was passed in the Fifty-fourth Congress, but I have not referred to it. That resolution was either passed I think at the close of the session of the Fifty-fourth Congress or at the special session of the Fifty-fifth Congress. I am not sure.

Mr. GILLETT. Can the gentleman remember that?

Mr. MANN. I can remember I received clerk hire for the first month I was here at the Fifty-fifth Congress at the special session. May I ask the Chair whether he has volume 2, section 1151, of the Precedents before him?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair has that.

The Chair is prepared to rule. If this was an increase of salary, if the \$1,500 was a salary paid to the Members' clerks or to a specified officer of the Government, it would be clearly subject to the point of order under the rule that in the absence of a law fixing a salary the amount appropriated in the last appropriation bill has been held to be the legal salary. But this provision does not cover salaries, but makes an allowance to Members for clerk hire. If this introduced an appropriation for a new purpose, it would be subject to a point of order under the rule that a paragraph carrying an unauthorized appropriation being permitted to remain may be perfected by a germane amendment which does not introduce a new project of appropriation. It does not seem to the Chair that the amendment, which simply increases the amount of the appropriation, introduces a new project of appropriation, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado by substituting \$1,800 for \$2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "two thousand" and inserting "one thousand eight hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that this matter is of extreme importance. It affects the usefulness of every Member of this House and the efficiency of each and every one of his undertakings. Several years ago, and about the time when this salary was increased from \$1,200 to \$1,500, a law was passed also increasing the salary of Congressmen. Now, unless it had been the purpose to compel a contribution from the extra \$2,500 from the Congressman to the aid or assistance of his secretary, then surely the object sought by increasing only the salary of the Congressman would not perform the office of aiding the secretary. Now, the secretary is yonder at work all the time. The Congressman is supposed to be here, and is. The clerk does all the drudgery. He goes to the departments, he writes the letters, and attends generally to the business of the Congressman, whose duty is always here.



Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will take into consideration another thing: Some of us live thousands of miles away, while some live only a few miles away. We bring our clerks with us. We pay their fare and their family's, of course, as in my own particular case; but, by the way, I will not stop to discuss these other matters, because I know but little about them. Yet because I am a new Member it does not follow I do not know what I am talking about upon this subject. In my own case, as I was saying, I not only pay the fare of my clerk and his family from Colorado, but I have had an assistant with him constantly since I have been here, and a great deal of the time I have had a third assistant, and yet I have not felt myself overwell served, though I have the most efficient clerk in Congress; nor do I believe there is a Member of this House that believes he is overwell served by the services he has from one clerk. On the contrary, he knows he is not served too well to meet the demands of his constituents, and that he can not be served with a pittance of \$125 a month to this clerk.

Now, I believe that the clerks ought to have \$150 per month, as they are compelled to bear some of this burden that the Congressman bears. I believe this amendment, Mr. Chairman, ought to carry.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most inopportune time to press this amendment. In this bill the administration has shown a zeal for economy in every department of the Government, so that we have less estimates for increase of salaries than we have had for many years. There has been of late a great pressure for the increase in salaries of clerks in all the Government departments and throughout the country, to which Congress has not yielded, and if now we give this increase to our own clerks, while refusing it to all other clerks, I believe that public opinion will severely censure us. Regardless of the question of whether a clerk renders a service worth \$2,000 or not, I think this year, when our administration is urging economy, and when this side of the House is going out and leaving a new majority, it will be suicidal and foolish for us to adopt this amendment.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will not the gentleman concede that at the time the \$1,200 was fixed for salaries of clerks he could live much more cheaply than he can now? Does he not appreciate the fact that his living expense has crawled up from 25 to 30 per cent, and that he only received 25 per cent of an increase when he was raised from \$1,000 to \$1,200?

Mr. GILLET. There was an increase of 25 per cent, and I do not think we ought to increase it again to-day when refusing other general increases.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. What does a Senator's clerk get?

Mr. GILLET. They get the same salary that the gentleman suggests.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Two thousand dollars?

Mr. GILLET. All the officials at the other end of the Capitol get more than the officials here.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is there any reason why a Senator's secretary should be paid more?

Mr. GILLET. They claim that there is. I think there is more extravagance at the other end of the Capitol than there is here, and I should dislike to have us imitate it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a very inopportune time to propose an increase in this compensation. Ever since the compensation of Members of Congress was increased the one argument used throughout the country in relation to the increased compensation of all Government employees has been that Congress increased its own salary, recognizing the conditions of increased cost of living, and these employees insisted on substantial increases in the Government service in all the departments. Now, it seems to me that at this time, during the closing hours of a Congress which is to go out within sixty-odd days, to be succeeded by a Congress of different political faith, it is not the time to be increasing the compensation of employees who are associated in any way with Members of this House in the discharge of their duties. I know how efficient, how hard working, and how necessary this clerical assistance is; but, at the same time, I do not believe that we should at this time vote this increase. I wish at least to appear in opposition to it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I believe not only that the clerks or private secretaries to Members ought to be compensated at \$1,800 a year, but I think also that they ought to be placed upon the roll of the House as other regular employees of the House now

are. There is this distinction between them and Government clerks residing in Washington: A Government clerk who is employed throughout the year can live in the city of Washington. Members' clerks have their traveling expenses to pay in order that they may perform the necessary confidential services to the Member and to attend to the public business of his constituents. The clerk ought to be with him during the months that the Member is at home and he ought to be with him during every session here at Washington. The matter of traveling expenses is a large item, probably a very large item if the private secretary has some family of his own in addition to himself to provide for.

This matter has been mooted at different times. I think it will meet the judgment of the House when fairly expressed that \$1,800, considering the particular facts I have adverted to, is scarcely an adequate salary for the type of secretary that ought to be employed by a Member of Congress attending actively to the business of his constituents and the country at large. I do not know personally in my 10 years of service in this body of any class of public servants who work so many hours and for so inadequate compensation as the competent clerk or secretary of a Member of this body.

It may be urged with reason, I think, that a clerk to a Member of this House should have as much pay as a clerk to a Senator. They receive \$2,000 per year. It is well known to the Members of this body that in addition to the clerk to the Senator they are provided with other help in the form of messengers and others, whom we do not have. It is certainly not more than is needed, and I think that as Members we need not fear any unjust criticism for doing what is plainly right in this regard. It is no more than just and right that the clerks to Members should receive \$1,800 a year, and in my judgment they should also be placed upon the regular roll of the House. They can not be put on the roll of House employees in this appropriation bill against a point of order. I see no objection, however, to this increase, which is ruled to be in order by the Chair.

I desire to say further, before I take my seat, it is the experience of active Members of this body that they find the compensation now provided for clerks of Members inadequate to meet their necessary expenses for clerical help. Personally, it is not, perhaps, improper for me to say there has been scarcely a year since I have been a Member of this body that, in addition to the regular compensation allowed to me and by me turned over to my secretary, it has not been necessary for me to contribute out of my personal funds for the payment of a competent clerk, and I have no doubt many other Members of the House have had the same experience. I think we ought to sustain the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, it may not be a gracious thing for a Member of the House to oppose an amendment which proposes to increase the salary of his clerk. Four years ago, when we increased our own salaries, I said it would be inconsistent for us to increase our salaries 50 per cent and not increase the salaries of the Government clerks all along down the line at the same ratio. We have been hearing from that ever since. I believe if there is going to be an increase in salaries, it ought not to be in the high but in the low places. Now, we should not consider alone our own clerks. We are allowed \$1,500 to pay our clerk hire, and if we do not think \$1,500 sufficient to pay for our clerks, why, then, we can contribute something from our own increased salaries to pay for the necessary assistance to be used in the discharge of our duties.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that a great many Members on your side have two clerks, one of them receiving \$2,000 a year and the other \$1,500, paid by the Government, one of the clerks being given to the Member as chairman of committee?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. There will not be any Members on our side next year who will have two clerks, one of whom is a clerk to the Member and the other of whom is clerk to the chairman of the committee.

I am not at all interested in the people who are going to have them; but we on this side are going to stand on the ground floor next year and have nothing for assistants except the regular clerk hire of \$1,500 a year. But I simply say, if we increase the allowances now from \$1,500 to \$1,800 or \$2,000, it will be practically increasing our own salaries so much. It will be practically a grab out of the Treasury of \$300 or \$500 for ourselves to spend for clerk hire next year. The Republican Party here will be justly charged with making a grab

out of the Treasury in the last few days of our service here, if we do this, and I submit that we ought not to put ourselves in that position.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I suppose the gentleman has not overlooked the fact that this allowance will not begin until July 1, 1911.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. That is correct, and I do not propose for one instant to give the Republican Party the record of trying to grab this little miserly sum out of the Treasury, which will be actually, in substance, an increase of our own salaries.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman talks about making a grab out of the Treasury.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. That is what it is.

Mr. MANN. Is not this doing something that is proper when the parties change, so that that charge can not justly be made?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. If they want it, let the Democrats take the responsibility of it next year.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in favor of the amendment. We are all economists. There never was a man who conducted a raid on the Treasury who did not do it in the interests of economy, and the more money he expected to get out of it, the more he declaimed for economy. This question should not be decided altogether on the ground of how much it is going to cost the Government. There is also to be taken into consideration the naked fact whether or not the clerks of Members, who are supposed to be paid and are paid by the Government, are receiving adequate compensation for the services they render. This particular class of Government servants are in a category by themselves—they are set apart from all others. There is great difficulty in doing anything for them. Members have stated, I think upon the floor, at least I know many of them have in private conversation, that they are against increasing clerks' salaries because it is not mandatory upon the Member to turn this allowance over to the clerk, and that there must be some basis for this suggestion is eloquently shown by the fact that there is constant opposition in this House to any attempt to put the clerks upon a regular roll at a fixed salary, payable to them by the proper officer, where they rightfully belong. It seems that that can not be done. It seems also that for the reason that they are not upon the roll, objection is made to any attempt to increase their salaries, so that through no fault of their own they are ground between the upper and the nether millstones. They are between the devil and the deep sea all the time. So far as I am concerned, either proposition appeals to me. My clerk earns much more money than he receives from the Government.

I am not in a position to give him more compensation. I find it difficult enough under any circumstances, in view of the energetic fight made upon me in my district by our friends on the other side of the House, to save money enough to pay my campaign expenses each succeeding term. I have a first-class secretary, a man who can go into court and report cases, a man competent to hold a place upon the floor of this House or as a committee reporter; yet the men who do that work are paid \$5,000 a year, and my clerk, who is so competent, works like a drudge for this small salary. He is growing older, as I am. A secretary may get married. In fact, my secretary is married. He has to keep his family and support himself here on \$1,500 a year, in the meantime rendering services far beyond the higher amount that has been suggested here.

Now, why should this question as to whether or not these men are being amply and properly compensated be beclouded by these other considerations as to whether or not they are on a roll or as to whether or not the Members turn the allowance over to them? There should not be any such question. The House should decide this solely upon the ground whether or not these men are being amply and properly compensated for the valuable work that they do, and I hope that the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad indeed to have an increase in allowance for clerk hire, for it is almost impossible to secure competent persons to do the work that is necessary to be done, but I do not wish to have an employee in this House detailed to do this work. If I am to be allowed a private secretary, I want him to be my secretary, to work under my direction, to be in my confidence and under my control in order to help me, and it is not a particle of trouble to me to take the checks and indorse them to him or them—for it is often necessary to have more than one—and let them go on and draw the money and divide it.

I protest against the mockery of talking about allowing a Member a private secretary and then, in order to save the trouble of indorsing and passing the checks or cashing them,

putting him on the rolls of the House and making him an official of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there ought not to be any question of politics in this. The only question involved is whether secretaries are worth more compensation than they are receiving. The question is whether the work they are doing is properly paid for. The question at issue is, Are we willing to go on record to do justice to a lot of men who give their time and experience to the service of the Government? All the men who are engaged as private secretaries to Members of the House are required to be trained in the line of work that they are called upon to do. It takes years of time to train them to become efficient secretaries. They have to give some years to the study of the work. They are required to be first-class stenographers, and they are also required to be able to operate a typewriting machine efficiently.

You can not find this class of men every day, and when you do find them you ought to be willing to pay them a compensation commensurate with the knowledge they have of the work they are required to do. In the commercial life of the Nation men who perform this kind of work get very much more pay than the men that are engaged as secretaries of Members of the House.

I may say that some Members of the House have so much work to do that they are required to have two or three men to perform it, and in some instances I know where men who serve here as Members pay as much as \$4,500 for clerical work. They do not pay this because they want to be liberal with the secretary, but they simply pay it because they feel that they ought to do the work devolved upon them as Members of Congress.

Representing a district such as honors me with a seat here, I am called upon to answer at least fifty or sixty thousand letters every year, and if anybody can tell me of any secretary that can perform this work I would like to have his picture. I am obliged to employ three men most of the time to accomplish the work I am called upon to do or let the work go undone. While I am a Member of Congress I propose to do the work that devolves upon me to the best of my ability. Now, I am pleading not to have any additional compensation that may come to me, but for justice to the man that I employ as secretary. It is unfair to say that the increase of compensation to secretaries is a grab from the Treasury for the Member, for I assume that no Member of this House takes any part of the compensation that is given for clerk hire for his own use, and that no matter what the salary may be by a vote of this House every cent of that salary will go to the man if the increase is made.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. The gentleman from Illinois states that he hires help outside of his regular secretary.

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Then if you get this \$300 will not that reduce the amount that you have to pay outside of the secretary's salary?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Of course it will, for you will not have to pay that much more.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am asking this for the purpose of doing justice to the man who has to take charge of the work and direct the other people that I am obliged to employ. I believe that a man who has charge of the work of a Member ought to be paid commensurate with the work he is required to do. Ordinarily the longer he is in the service the more efficient he becomes, the more valuable he is to the people of the country, and I believe the more valuable he becomes the more he ought to be paid. For one Member of the House I am willing to go on record in favor of just compensation for men who are qualified to perform the work, which I believe is the most important work to be performed in the interest of good government and of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen say they want to do justice to their secretaries and their clerks, and that that is the only reason for appealing to this House to give them an increase of compensation. I want to do justice to the poor devil who is working 16 hours a day in some country store, who is being taxed to help pay this compensation, and who would gladly surrender that job to take the one from me at \$125 a month. That is the man I want to do justice to. I want to keep every burden off his back that I possibly can. It is idle for Members to talk about justice being done to their clerks, and all of them that vote for this proposition, Mr.



Chairman, will do so for the sole and express purpose of benefiting themselves, hoping that the increased compensation will enable them to secure the services of a clerk who will do a little more work for them. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says that he has to employ three clerks to do his work. I would not be personal for anything in the world, but I can call to mind now numbers of Representatives who are getting \$125 a month each month for their secretaries who have not darkened the door of this House since Congress convened on the 5th day of this month. Gentlemen, do you think they ought to have any extra compensation for themselves or for their clerks?

Do you believe that that would be doing justice by the boys who till the soil, or stand behind the counters in the country stores for from 10 to 16 hours every day? Do you believe that would be doing justice by the toiling masses of the country from one end of it to the other? I want to say to you that, in my judgment, for the amount of work that the average clerk of a Congressman has to do—mind you, I say the average—they are the best paid young men that I know of anywhere. Their hours are short as a rule, and when they are at home on their vacations that sometimes last for six or seven months of the year, they do not write, many of them, over a dozen letters a day, and then they are at liberty to go out for a horseback ride, or take a row in a skiff, or enjoy some other sport or pleasure for the balance of the day.

Mr. BUTLER. Joy rides?

Mr. MACON. Yes; take joy rides, and yet Members tell us these clerks are not getting compensation sufficient to justify them in holding their positions.

Mr. Chairman, it is not incumbent upon the Government to give any Congressman a clerk.

It is gratuity, pure and simple, for the Government to supply Congressmen with clerks. We are supposed to do our own work, use our own brains, muscle, and skill, if we possess any. Yet the Government has magnanimously stepped in and said that it would take a part of the burden off our shoulders and give us somebody with younger legs, perhaps, than we have to run an errand for us now and then; give us some one a little more skilled with the typewriter to write our letters; somebody to relieve us of a part of the burden of the obligation that we have assumed. And, gentlemen, let me tell you that, in my judgment, we are all getting just about as much compensation as we earn. I hope no Democrat, at an hour when we are calling upon the country to give us its confidence, when we are complaining against the extravagances of the Republican Party, will give the lie to our declaration by casting a vote to put upon the backs of the people a burden of more than \$200,000 by increasing the salaries of the clerks to the Congressmen. To do so will be to virtually increase our own emoluments of office.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MANN. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment to the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) the ayes were 49 and the noes 61.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, and, without objection, that amendment will again be reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUCKER of Colorado) there were—ayes 40, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I now move to amend by making it \$1,650.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "one thousand five hundred" and insert "one thousand six hundred and fifty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For stationery for Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and Resident Commissioners, including \$5,000 for stationery for the use of the committees and officers of the House, \$54,750.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the gentleman having the bill in charge, who buys stationery for the House of Representatives? Where does it come from? I ask this question because I have had some of the poorest paper upon which to write that I have ever had in my life. It is rough, miserable writing paper.

Mr. GILLETT. Our investigation did not go so far as to discover or inquire who did furnish the paper, and I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This appropriation is for stationery for Members, \$54,750.

Mr. GILLETT. It is bought after advertising, after advertising for bids, and I know nothing about the details.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think really, and I say it in good faith, there should be something in the way of an investigation before the contract for the stationery of the House is let again, because some of the paper, I have it now, is as poor writing paper as I have ever seen anywhere.

Mr. MANN. May I inquire what kind of paper?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is small paper, and large paper, too.

Mr. MANN. Ordinary note paper?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is not note size; no. It is longer from left to right as you lay it on the table. I do not know what you call it, but it is not up and down note paper.

Mr. MANN. It is not the ordinary stationery that is supplied.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is stationery for the House of Representatives, and I have some of it in my office now.

Mr. MANN. That is not the ordinary stationery that is supplied; somebody must have ordered that paper specially.

Mr. GILLETT. It is just half size.

Mr. MANN. They furnish you the kind of paper you want. The ordinary paper we have is letterhead and notehead.

Mr. GILLETT. That is notehead with the heading printed on the side, probably.

Mr. MANN. The ordinary paper we get is very good paper.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The paper I have is not.

Mr. MANN. Probably somebody specially ordered it for you.

The Clerk read as follows:

Custody, care, and maintenance of Library building and grounds; Superintendent of the Library building and grounds, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; clerk, \$1,600; clerk, \$1,400; clerk, \$1,000; messenger; assistant messenger; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; captain of watch, \$1,400; lieutenant of watch, \$1,000; 16 watchmen, at \$720 each; carpenter, \$900; painter, \$900; foreman of laborers, \$900; 14 laborers, at \$480 each; 2 attendants in ladies' room, at \$480 each; 4 check boys, at \$360 each; mistress of charwomen, \$425; assistant mistress of charwomen, \$300; 45 charwomen; chief engineer, \$1,500; assistant engineer, \$1,200; 3 assistant engineers, at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,200; machinist, \$1,000; machinist, \$900; 2 wiremen, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; 3 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 10 skilled laborers, \$720 each; in all, \$71,105.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 38, in line 11, after the word "thousand," strike out the word "one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seven."

Mr. GILLETT. That simply corrects the total.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For commissioner, acting as president of the commission, \$4,500; two commissioners, at \$4,000 each; chief examiner, \$3,000; secretary, \$2,500; assistant chief examiner, \$2,250; 2 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; examiner, \$2,400; 3 examiners, at \$2,000 each; 4 clerks of class 4; 4 examiners, at \$1,800 each; 20 clerks of class 3; 26 clerks of class 2; 35 clerks of class 1; 29 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; messenger; engineer, \$840; telephone switchboard operator; 2 firemen; 2 watchmen; elevator conductor, \$720; 3 laborers; and 3 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$204,510.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I would like to inquire of the gentleman how many increases of salary are given the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. GILLETT. There were five increases—no, there were six increases. There were 5 clerks at \$840 dropped, and instead of that we gave an examiner at \$2,400, a clerk of class 3, a clerk of class 2, a clerk of class 1, and one at \$1,000.

Mr. MANN. Well, last year there were five clerks, at \$840 each. Those are left out entirely. There were eight clerks of class 4. That is reduced to four, six out of the nine, and I assume that of those nine they had an increase of salary.

Mr. GILLETT. These assistant examiners were clerks of class 4, and we simply change their names.

Mr. MANN. Change their names?

Mr. GILLETT. And they have the same salary.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT. A clerk of class 4 gets \$1,800, and these four examiners are at \$1,800 salary.

Mr. MANN. Why these increases? The gentleman stated, as I understood it a while ago, there were 15 or 20, or perhaps more, increases in this bill.

Why do the Civil Service Commission clerks get five of them? I had sort of been led to believe that the Civil Service Commission was one of those bodies that work mainly for the public good, or for their health, and not on account of compensation.

Mr. GILLETT. I think they do work for the public good. I agree with the gentleman there. But the clerks also work for compensation, and the purpose is this: They have to work not simply as clerks, but all of these men are doing examiner's work, passing on papers, and they represented to us very strongly what, of course, the gentleman knows is true, that the work is increasing constantly and largely, and the force is very much overworked, and these men at \$840 could not be kept and could not be expected to be as efficient as they should be to pass on the examination papers. It is not easy work. It is a work that requires knowledge and judgment. They asked much more of an increase than we have given them, but we thought this was a fair amount of increase.

Mr. MANN. I am somewhat surprised that the work is increasing. It may be true, but I should have considerable doubt about that.

Mr. GILLETT. Of course, the gentleman appreciates it increases every year; the Government service increases every year, and the classification has increased. I do not believe there has been a year lately when there has not been an addition to the places brought within the civil service.

Mr. MANN. There has not been very much addition to the places in the civil service in the last two or three years.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman remembers the fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. MANN. A few postmasters, but not a very large number, and the number of new appointments is not increasing very greatly. Of course, the total number of places in the Government service has increased. I doubt whether there are as many applications now for appointments as there were two years ago.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. I do not think I am mistaken, but I do not make any statement of that sort. If the gentleman says it is so, of his own knowledge or somebody else's, it is accepted by me.

Mr. GILLETT. I was informed so. Of course, I do not know it of my own knowledge. There were 384,000 persons in the civil service on June 30.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; that is true, and most of them live to be very old, and the gentleman has a bill now pending which realizes that fact. The Civil Service Commission employees do not resign and hardly ever die. Of course that is not literally true, but there are no such number of changes under the Government, probably, as there were a few years ago. It is getting to be a settled thing, to a large extent.

Mr. GILLETT. A great many here in Washington resign every year. There are a great many here temporarily, who are here to continue their studies, quite a large force, just in that one line. And the departments can not keep a great many, I am told, at the lower grades. The Patent Office was complaining to us. They are taken away from them to go out into business life.

Mr. MANN. The Patent Office is a school that educates men for use outside; but some one has to educate them, and it is perfectly proper the Government should educate those men.

Mr. GILLETT. But it gives just so much more work to the commission to let those men come in.

Mr. MANN. There is not a great amount of work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest that the number of civil-service employees in rural delivery and city delivery is due largely to the work of that commission. Every rural-route carrier now goes through the civil-service examination.

Mr. MANN. Well, there have not been any men come into the classified service in that way for several years, and, if I am correctly informed, there have been no new rural routes created for several years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. A number of new rural routes have been provided for.

Mr. MANN. And appropriation has been made—

Mr. CAMPBELL. And the carrier has taken an examination and is on the list ready to begin work whenever the routes are established.

Mr. MANN. Whenever the Post Office Department is through with overriding the will of Congress. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not say that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has to be somewhat under the influence of the Postmaster General. I think a great deal of the Postmaster General, but he has no control over any appointees of mine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Evidently the gentleman from Illinois has none.

Mr. MANN. Neither in that department nor any other. Well, I will withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman, although I have doubts about it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expert examiners: For the employment of expert examiners not in the Federal service to prepare questions and rate papers in examinations on special subjects for which examiners within the service are not available, \$2,500.

Mr. MACON. I reserve the point of order on that paragraph, Mr. Chairman, on page 42, relating to expert examiners. It looks to me we have too many examiners in connection with the Government now.

Mr. GILLETT. As a reason for an appropriation for this purpose, the commission stated that there very often came before them applications for men of special technical knowledge for whom there is no one in their force capable of making the examination. That for the Agricultural Department, for instance, where they employ a great many specialists, who have to be men of high education along special lines, they have not anybody in the office of the commission who can either prepare the papers or examine them after they have been filled. So they have been obliged to go to the very department where the men were to be appointed and ask that department to detail somebody who would make up the examination papers and then afterwards pass upon them. That seemed to us hardly a proper thing to do, at least it offers a very wide field for favoritism. Therefore they asked an appropriation of \$5,000 to enable them now and then, when such examinations came up, to employ experts, not permanently, but just temporarily, in certain departments. We allowed them \$2,500, half of what they asked. There are a great many specialists in different lines, and as you know all have been covered into the civil service, so you have got to go somewhere and get persons with special knowledge sufficient to prepare the papers and to make the examination.

Mr. MACON. Have they not in the department some persons that they can get to do it?

Mr. GILLETT. That is what they have been doing. They have had to go to the very department that needed the men. Of course they only would have that knowledge where they were going to use these very men, so that the department that was going to employ these men would be the one that would examine them, which really allows the same men to select just whom they please. That is not in accord with our general system. The department should not be permitted to select, but they should be selected by those on the outside, who are unprejudiced. The present law does not allow that, and therefore we thought we would give them this money as an experiment and see if it works well.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, we are trying too many experiments now and have got too many employees in the departments to conduct them. While I have great faith in the committee that prepared this bill, still we recognize that we have to make some cuts here and not go into new experiments. I must insist upon the point of order, that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GILLETT. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts point out any law giving authority for this work?

Mr. GILLETT. I am not aware of any law sustaining this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary travelling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, \$12,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 29360, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.



## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 27400. An act to repeal an act authorizing the issuance of a patent to James F. Rowell.

## PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 709), which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed: *To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a report made by the Secretary of State, in which he presents a request made by the Spanish Chamber of Commerce of the Philippine Islands, through the royal Spanish legation at Washington, for a change of the maximum percentage of alcohol, fixed in paragraphs 262 and 263 of the Philippine tariff act (Stat. L., vol. 36, p. 164), for still wines at 14° to 15° in place of the fixed rate of 14°.

The suggestion of the Spanish Chamber of Commerce is approved by the War Department and the Government of the Philippine Islands, and would seem reasonable. I therefore recommend it favorably to the consideration of Congress.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 16, 1910.

## EXPENDITURES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department and ordered to be printed:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a statement by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, of appropriations, expenditures, and balances of appropriations under the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, as required by law.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 16, 1910.

## HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 55.

Resolved, That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. on Thursday, January 5, 1911.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GILLET. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Saturday, December 17, 1910, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for rebuilding the assay office in New York City (H. Doc. No. 1208); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Chief of Ordnance submitting an amendment to estimate of size of sum to be expended in office of Chief of Ordnance for skilled draftsmen, etc. (H. Doc. No. 1209); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting information as to the distribution of the Nobel peace prize for 1911 (S. Doc. No. 708); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs to the marine hospital at Key West, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 1210); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a statement of documents received and distributed by the department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1211); to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, submitted a report of the expenditures in the Department of Agriculture (No. 1780), which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

## ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. GILL of Missouri, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1881) for the relief of John H. Rheinlander, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1769), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6799) for the relief of John W. McGrath, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1770), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13065) for the relief of William H. Rogers, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1771), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16630) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1772), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 846) for the relief of Thomas B. Gourley, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1773), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. MASSEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 25785) for the relief of Charles Boster, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1774), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. CANDLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1113) entitling the owner of the launch *Elsa* to sue the United States for damages to said boat, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1775), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1416) for the relief of the International Enamelled Ware Co. and Stranski & Co., of New York City, N. Y., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1776), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8182) for the relief of J. M. Rodgers, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1777), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15918) for the relief of Abbie Bartleson, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1778), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23245) for the relief of Silas A. Bryant, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1779), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 28013) granting a pension to James W. Hollandsworth; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 29124) granting a pension to William Hinker; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 29411) granting an increase of pension to Tony Verrosso; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 29496) to increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 29497) to amend sections 1 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 51); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 29498) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia;" to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 29499) providing for the exchange of lands owned by individuals or corporations situate in the Petrified Forest Reserve in Arizona for other lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: A bill (H. R. 29500) to repeal a proviso in the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department, approved June 2, 1900, relating to the hours of labor for letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 29501) fixing the compensation of the collector of customs for the district of Charleston; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 29502) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pittsfield, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 29503) to promote the erection of a memorial in conjunction with a Perry's victory centennial celebration on Put-in-Bay Island during the year 1913 in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the battle of Lake Erie and the northwestern campaign of Gen. William Henry Harrison in the War of 1812; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 29504) to require the production of books and papers as evidence in State courts in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER (by request): A bill (H. R. 29505) to repeal an act entitled "An act to provide for terms of the United States circuit and district courts at Cumberland, Md.," approved March 21, 1892; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOXLEY: A bill (H. R. 29506) to provide for the erection of a public building in Cicero, Cook County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: Resolution (H. Res. 877) authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee to perform certain duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOELKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by abrogating that part of the Constitution which prohibits an export tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) authorizing the President to extend an invitation to foreign Governments to send delegates to an international congress on social insurance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 29507) granting an increase of pension to William J. Davisson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29508) granting an increase of pension to James McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 29509) granting a pension to Helen M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29510) granting a pension to Margaret Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29511) making provision for the promotion and retirement of Capt. Robert Edwin Peary, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 29512) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Delay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29513) granting an increase of pension to George Zabriskie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29514) granting an increase of pension to Harry W. Leitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29515) granting an increase of pension to William Newson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29516) granting an increase of pension to James Milton Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 29517) granting a pension to David King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29518) granting a pension to Mary J. Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 29519) granting a pension to Anna Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29520) granting a pension to Mollie Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29521) granting an increase of pension to Louisa C. Chesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29522) granting an increase of pension to John Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29523) granting an increase of pension to George W. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29524) granting a pension to Pearl Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 29525) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 29526) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Musgrove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29527) granting an increase of pension to John Waltermann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29528) for the relief of estate of John T. Shumate; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29529) granting a pension to Sarah J. Lush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 29530) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Studley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 29531) granting a pension to Bianca Blenker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29532) granting an increase of pension to Edward Loreaux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29533) granting an increase of pension to George H. Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29534) granting an increase of pension to Henry Seibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29535) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Zurner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29536) granting an increase of pension to John Breiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29537) granting an increase of pension to George M. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29538) granting an increase of pension to Eden Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29539) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 29540) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Stoliker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 29541) granting an increase of pension to David James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29542) granting an increase of pension to Sanford C. Wilhoite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 29543) granting a pension to Mary E. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29544) granting a pension to James H. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29545) granting an increase of pension to George H. Fisler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29546) granting an increase of pension to James Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29547) granting an increase of pension to James Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29548) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Matthew Sloan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 29549) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29550) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Daily; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29551) granting an increase of pension to Levi T. E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 29552) granting an increase of pension to Lycurgus Botkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 29553) granting an increase of pension to Emil Wiegler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 29554) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin K. Doudna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29555) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hime; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29556) granting an increase of pension to John G. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29557) granting an increase of pension to Salem Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29558) granting an increase of pension to James Kemp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29559) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29560) granting an increase of pension to William K. Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29561) granting an increase of pension to John M. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29562) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Mast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29563) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Hewel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29564) granting an increase of pension to David Burks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29565) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Stover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29566) granting an increase of pension to William Brice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29567) granting an increase of pension to Richard Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29568) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Tracy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29569) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rodefer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29570) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29571) granting an increase of pension to George W. Phipps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29572) granting an increase of pension to Peter Larson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29573) granting an increase of pension to Francis X. Kapps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29574) granting an increase of pension to Clay Deckert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29575) granting an increase of pension to Frank Emonnin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29576) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Schutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29577) granting an increase of pension to William Trew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29578) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29579) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29580) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Pottenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29581) granting an increase of pension to Jerry Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29582) granting a pension to Ira V. Ennis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29583) granting a pension to Nolan Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29584) granting a pension to Ella H. Candy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29585) granting a pension to Frank Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29586) granting a pension to Horace W. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29587) granting a pension to Charles E. Schindler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29588) granting a pension to Charles Mayrwieser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29589) granting a pension to James E. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29590) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Ehrstine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29591) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Lewis Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROW: A bill (H. R. 29592) granting an increase of pension to Norman H. Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29593) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 29594) granting a pension to John E. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 29595) granting a pension to Mary Ann Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29596) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus S. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 29597) granting an increase of pension to Perry S. Grindle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29598) granting an increase of pension to Garrett Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 29599) granting an increase of pension to John T. Breeson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUREY: A bill (H. R. 29600) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Dunaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29601) granting an increase of pension to Elmina S. Ames; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 29602) granting a pension to Daniel P. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 29603) granting an increase of pension to Lucian F. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29604) granting an increase of pension to Don C. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 29605) granting an increase of pension to William Kemmory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29606) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29607) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 29608) granting a pension to Dell J. Harrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29609) granting an increase of pension to George H. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: A bill (H. R. 29610) granting an increase of pension to Emelia Stork; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 29611) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 29612) granting an increase of pension to James Y. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 29613) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 29614) granting an increase of pension to James A. McConkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMER: A bill (H. R. 29615) granting an increase of pension to George Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 29616) for the relief of Louis Dunham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29617) granting a pension to James Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAVENS: A bill (H. R. 29618) granting an increase of pension to Willis C. Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 29619) granting an increase of pension to James Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 29620) granting a pension to J. P. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29621) granting a pension to William L. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29622) for the relief of S. G. W. Morrison; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29623) granting an increase of pension to Wesley E. Grimm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 29624) granting an increase of pension to Sue E. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29625) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Cundiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29626) granting an increase of pension to Willis Noel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 29627) granting an increase of pension to James McAfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 29628) granting an increase of pension to James N. Dudley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29629) granting an increase of pension to Harlin Van Etten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 29630) granting an increase of pension to John P. McMahon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29631) granting an increase of pension to F. R. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOYCE: A bill (H. R. 29632) granting an increase of pension to William Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 29633) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. E. Schaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29634) granting a pension to Oscar S. Bayliss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 29635) for the relief of Patrick Howe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: A bill (H. R. 29636) granting an increase of pension to John R. Lake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 29637) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Nickels; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 29638) granting an increase of pension to Ruben Lyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 29639) granting a pension to Hattie A. Winfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 29640) granting an increase of pension to John W. Chastain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 29641) granting an increase of pension to James W. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29642) granting a pension to James M. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 29643) for the relief of Nathan Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29644) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Delaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 29645) to amend the military record of Jacob Koller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 29646) granting a pension to Charles C. Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 29647) granting an increase of pension to John W. Parnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29648) granting an increase of pension to Martin Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29649) granting an increase of pension to David Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29650) granting an increase of pension to David O. Giffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLACHLAN of California: A bill (H. R. 29651) for the relief of Benjamin L. Gorsuch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29652) granting an increase of pension to Seabird Cochrane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29653) granting a pension to Eliza De Rudio; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 29654) for the relief of Parintha McCluer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29655) for the relief of Charles A. W. Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29656) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Fountain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29657) granting an increase of pension to Sidney R. Wolcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29658) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 29659) granting an increase of pension to Emmor H. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29660) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29661) to authorize the Secretary of War to reconvey a strip of land in Hamilton County, Tenn., to N. C. Steele; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORGAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 29662) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Van Meter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 29663) granting an increase of pension to James M. Blankenship; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 29664) granting a pension to Nicholas Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29665) granting a pension to Emeline R. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29666) granting an increase of pension to Eben E. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29667) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Getchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29668) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Wyeth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29669) granting an increase of pension to Oliver E. Tillotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29670) to correct the military record of James H. Bishop; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 29671) for the relief of Bvt. Brig. Gen. George B. Dandy, retired; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 29672) for the relief of Thomas C. Hyde; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29673) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29674) for the relief of the heirs of the late Maj. Daniel Madden; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 29675) granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus C. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29676) granting a pension to Rachel Millert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29677) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29678) granting a pension to Jennie C. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 29679) granting a pension to John S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29680) granting a pension to Sandy G. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: A bill (H. R. 29681) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Blacklock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 29682) granting an increase of pension to Sarah McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 29683) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 29684) granting an increase of pension to John Keenan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 29685) for the relief of Alfred J. Drake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 29686) for the relief of Robert M. Cannon, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29687) granting an increase of pension to James Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 29688) granting an increase of pension to James A. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 29689) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Houser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 29690) for the relief of the executrix of the late Gen. Gilbert S. Carpenter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 29691) granting an increase of pension to Michael Schone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29692) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 29693) granting an increase of pension to Sebastain Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 29694) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Guild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 29695) granting an increase of pension to George T. Michaels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29696) granting an increase of pension to John S. McGinness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29697) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29698) granting an increase of pension to Francis Lombard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29699) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29700) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 29701) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Skillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 29702) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 29703) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Loranger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 29704) granting an increase of pension to Jane Quint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 29705) granting a pension to David K. Arrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Washington, D. C., praying for the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the United States History Class, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for legislation for the caring of dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Venango Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, praying for legislation to prevent the substitution of oleomargarine for dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorials of Cole Bros., of Marshall; Straus Bros., A. M. Basch & Son, Edward Buy, Straus & Louis Co., Platt Bros. & Co., and H. L. Williams, all of Danville; also Erzinger Bros., of Kankakee, all in the State of Illinois, and other merchants, protesting against the enactment of a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Lowell Meserve Hardware Co., of Colorado Springs, Colo., protesting against legislation for the extension of the parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Louisiana, protesting against the draining of the swamp land in Atchafalaya district before the banks of the Mississippi River have been prepared for the additional flow of water; to the Committee on Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi River.

Also, memorial of the City Council of Newark, N. J., praying that the Panama Exposition may be located in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, memorial of the Municipal Council of Tudela, Cebu, P. I., approving of the proposition for immediate independence of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of the employees at the navy yard at Charleston, S. C., protesting against the system of civil-service retirement which curtails the present salaries of the employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of Mrs. Clara Hayward Harris, of New York City, on the subject of high wages and the laws relating thereto; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Kenesaw Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Danville, Ill., protesting against the passage of the volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of G. R. Nokes and I. N. Nokes, of Watonga, Okla., approving of the movement for suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Hoopeston (Ill.) Retail Merchants' and Business Men's Association, praying that the World's Panama Exposition may be located at New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, memorial of the West & Slade Grocery Co., protesting against the enactment of a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Military Tract Educational Association of Illinois, protesting against Government aid under the Mor-

rill Act for education in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, praying for legislation for the further regulation of railroads and the improvement of rivers and harbors, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Hinde-Daugh Paper Co., of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for legislation to give authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to make classification of freight uniform; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, protesting against legislation which will curtail the revenues of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petitions of merchants of Woodbury, La Grange, Newnan, Columbus, and Greenville, all in the State of Georgia, for regulation of express charges by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of certain merchants of Columbus and Villa Rica, both in the State of Georgia, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Cranford Faun, the Corn Exchange, and others, of Erie County, N. Y., against the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Washington, D. C., approving resolutions of Retail Clerks' Association No. 262; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Canfield Post, No. 124, Grand Army of the Republic, of Gibsonburg, Ohio, for amendment to the age pension act; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Paper to accompany a bill for relief of Robert E. Eddy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ricksecker Post, No. 469, Grand Army of the Republic, of Canal Dover, Ohio, for amendment to the age pension act; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Beaver Lumber Co., of Springboro, Pa., against the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens and taxpayers of the United States, favoring Senate bill 5677, for benefit of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Cloverdale Grange, No. 1111, and West Green Grange, No. 1296, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring amendment of the oleomargarine law (S. 5842); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of D. G. Curtis, of the Erie Lumber Co.; W. Ed. Marsh; John J. Miller, secretary of the Mutual Telephone Co.; H. Hinrichs, Jr., secretary of the Keystone Fish Co.; Charles S. Clark, secretary of Constable Bros.; F. F. Lippitt, secretary of the Automatic Oil Can Co.; J. B. Patterson, secretary of the United States Chair Co.; J. D. Jenkins, of Schaffner Bros.; A. J. Sterrett, secretary of the Erie Malleable Iron Co.; F. P. Hatch, of E. W. Hatch Co.; Hall Bros. & Co.; George F. Hall, treasurer of the American Sterilizer Co.; E. G. Canfisch, of the Beaver Lumber Co.; F. W. Agnew, secretary of the Business Men's Association; E. W. Irwin, president of the Erie Storage & Carting Co.; J. E. Sternberg, vice president of the First National Bank; William B. Trask, president of the Marine National Bank; and Henry T. Sevin, against the passage of the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCLAY: Petition of Newton Grange, No. 1257, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mehaffy, Pa., for Senate bill 5842; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of H. G. Riveling, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of White Lake, S. Dak., for the Dodds bill (H. R. 22239); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Henry C. Musgrove, Sarah J. Lush, and John Wollermon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany a bill for relief of J. T. Shumate; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, for Senate bill 5677, relative to benefit of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Local No. 262, Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, against proposed plan to increase hours of Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of H. L. Russell, dean of Agricultural College of Wisconsin, for House bill 15422; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of legislature of Wisconsin, for enactment of House bill 39, relative to extending limits of Shiloh National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petition of Butler Encampment of Odd Fellows, of Hamilton, Ohio, for legislation making it a criminal offense for any person, firm, or corporation to publish, sell, or offer for sale what purports to be the written work of any fraternal order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mitchell Post, No. 361, Grand Army of the Republic, of Camden, Ohio, and Milton Weaver Post, No. 594, Grand Army of the Republic, of Vandalia, Ohio, for amendment of the age pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Anna L. Yable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Fort Edwards Brewing Co., for removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of Pacific Slope Congress, regarding a breakwater at Monterey Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of D. A. Russell and others, against the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the California Society of Sons of the Revolution, regarding unpublished archives of the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of Pacific Slope Congress, regarding a national highway; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of officers of Milford Grange, No. 773, Patrons of Husbandry, of Juniata County, Pa., favoring Senate bill 5842, relative to oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of Schertz (Tex.) Camp, No. 1262, Woodmen of the World, favoring the Dodds bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of committee of employees of Chicago Great Western Railway at Mankato, Minn., for hearings on railway rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Minnesota Cannery Association, for Federal inspection of canning factories and canned products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAVENS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Willis C. Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Hollandsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of William H. Huffman and Amanda C. Swiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Ladshaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOYCE: Petitions of Dresden (Ohio) Post, No. 415, and Newport (Ohio) Post, No. 489, Grand Army of the Republic, for amendment to the age pension act; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of Walter Richards, of Brookville, Pa., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Brookville (Pa.) Brewing Co., for removal of the tariff on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Malloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petitions of Granges Nos. 34, 941, 924, 365, and 1338, for Senate bill 5842 and House bill 20582; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin Dwight Critchlow; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: Petition of David Lupton's Sons Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring New Orleans for the Panama Canal Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of E. H. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to resurvey a strip of land in Hamilton County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elijah W. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Civil Service Reform Association of Pennsylvania, to enlarge scope of civil-service law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Coppack Warner Lumber Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring New Orleans for the Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, Local No. 262, against increase of labor hours for Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Petition of David W. Bohn and Henry A. Miller, of Grange No. 551, Patrons of Husbandry, of Shoemakersville, Pa., for amendment of law on oleomargarine (S. 5842); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Thomas Blacklock, William G. Baker, and Margarite D. Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Memorial of Woman's Literary Club of Bound Brook, N. J., asking for the speedy and thorough investigation of the spread of disease to human beings from dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, affidavits to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas Skillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of R. V. Kuser, of the People's Brewing Co., of Trenton, N. J., for the removal of the tariff on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Jamestown Brewing Co., for removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

SATURDAY, December 17, 1910.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m., Thursday, January 5, 1911, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 27400) to repeal an act authorizing the issuance of a patent to James F. Rowell, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

### HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the privileged resolution from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 55) of the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
December 16, 1910.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m., Thursday, January 5, 1911.

Mr. HALE. I move that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of sundry citizens and business firms of Nixon and Fort Worth, Tex.; of Elwood, Ind.; of Bellefontaine, Ohio; of Kankakee, Ill.; and of Demopolis, Ala., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of Joliet, Ill., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Kenesaw Post, No. 77, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Danville, Ill., remonstrating against the establishment of a volunteer officers' retired list, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.